

COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF WINNIPEG

Thursday, September 26, 2024

The Council met at 9:52 a.m.

The Clerk advised the Speaker that a quorum was present.

The Speaker called the meeting to order.

In accordance with Rule 11.1 of the City of Winnipeg Procedure By-law No. 50/2007, the Speaker acknowledged that we are in Treaty One Territory, the home and traditional lands of the Anishinaabe (Ojibwe), Ininew (Cree), and Dakota peoples, and in the National Homeland of the Red River Métis. Our drinking water comes from Shoal Lake 40 First Nation, in Treaty Three Territory.

The opening prayer was ready by Councillor Mayes.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Councillor Wyatt.

INTRODUCTION AND ANNOUNCEMENTS

Madam Speaker: Let us now welcome our pages for today. We have Saylem Meleck, from Dakota Collegiate, who resides in the Fort Garry...Fort Rouge-East Fort Garry Ward, and Koeun Lee, from École Secondaire Oak Park High School who resides in the Charleswood-Tuxedo-Westwood Ward. Welcome to you both, thank you for serving Council today. We will now move into morning announcements. Councillor Cindy Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Isn't the Mayor first?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor. Mr. Mayor, be first.

Mayor Gillingham: Sure. No problem. Either is good with me. Thank you, Madam Speaker. Good morning to everybody. Just some...a few announcements this morning. I think we were all deeply saddened to hear of the sudden passing of Grand Chief Cathy Merrick on September 6th. And we were all elected in 2022, right around the same time that Cathy Merrick was elected as Grand Chief. And since becoming Mayor I have had the privilege of working closely with Grand Chief Merrick and certainly valued the time that we have spent together. Her leadership, her strength and compassion touched many lives. And we know that she will be deeply missed by, certainly, family, friends and the Assembly of Manitoba Chiefs and Indigenous communities across the country. I said before and I will restate, which others have echoed around this Chamber, that her death is not only a loss to the Indigenous community, but truly all Winnipeggers, all Manitobans and, indeed, all Canadians. I was honoured to attend the service in her home community of Pimicikamak and for a beautiful funeral service with others. September 30th coming up, as Councillor Mayes alluded to, is Orange Shirt Day; the National Day for Truth and Reconciliation, and I encourage all City employees and Members of Council to join me and show their support by wearing an orange shirt to work tomorrow. And on Monday I will be participating in Orange Shirt Day Powwow, organized by Wa-Say Healing Centre, where there will be remembering...where we will be remembering the children that did not return home from residential schools. And I know Councillor...or Madam Speaker, that so many Council members, most Council members, do participate in one or more Orange Shirt Day events. Yesterday I took part in the unveiling of a monument to commemorate the lives tragically lost in the 1972 plane crash, that took the lives of 8 residential school students and their pilot on the way home to Bunibonibee Cree Nation. The permanent marker located on the Yellow Ribbon Greenway Trail in St. James, near the corner of Silver and Linwood, honours their memory and acknowledges the deep impact on the families and community. The monument serves as a step in our shared journey toward reconciliation and helps to ensure that future generations will remember these lives and learn about this painful chapter in our shared history. I want to commend the Royal Aviation Museum of Western Canada and all the partners who had a part in any way in getting this small park plaza established, and certainly, in yesterday's events, to mark this significant moment in our history. The...just a couple of comments about the Winnipeg Metropolitan Region; most of you know, I think everybody knows around this Council Chamber, that Winnipeg Metropolitan Region and its membership was established by provincial legislation and, of course, Winnipeg is a member. The WMR has been in the process of developing a regional plan as was required and mandated by the Province of Manitoba. Recently, the Premier announced that new legislation will be introduced that will likely, very likely in fact, impact the membership of the Winnipeg Met Region and subsequently then impact Plan 2050. And so, as a

central member of the WMR, we await the legislation and its impact before discussing and determining next steps. Recently, the Winnipeg Met Region Board Members did meet with Minister Bushie, had a really good discussion, and will continue to work with the Province on what they deem are the next steps that they require. This morning, the Public Service issued a news release about the successful applicants to the first round of the Housing Accelerator Grants. I am very excited that the City will be supporting the development of 1,135 new housing units in Winnipeg, including 597 affordable units and 613 located in downtown Winnipeg. The list of projects includes office to residential conversions, surface parking lot development, mixed-use developments, partnership with Indigenous organizations and a lot of deeply affordable and rent geared to income units, as well. And I think all of us want to commend Moira Geer and her HAF team for designing a robust evaluation process and for doing a lot of great work in a condensed timeline. And this process helps us to develop a pipeline of potential housing projects and our HAF team will be working with many of the unsuccessful applicants to help them identify other funding opportunities. One of the exciting things about this first round of grants is that it was over-subscribed...substantially over subscribed. But again, those who are unsuccessful applicants, our staff will continue to work with them, and this is a pipeline for other funding opportunities. Finally, we have had many great Winnipeg 150 celebrations. Thank you to Councilors who, around this Chamber, have put together 150 events in their ward. There is more to come. I think there is one in Waverly West with Councillor Lukes this Saturday. And one...Councillor Gilroy is going to mention one as well, I think. Very good, coming up. So, it is great to see all the participation. Another event we have coming up is the Winnipeg 150 Mayor's Ball that will be held at the RBC Convention Centre on October the 5th. Proceeds will go to support the four major performing arts organizations: the Royal Winnipeg Ballet, the Manitoba Opera, Royal Manitoba Theater Centre and the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra. And I look forward to seeing many of my colleagues there. And as I said, there are many more opportunities to celebrate Winnipeg 150 coming up. So, I want to encourage everyone to check out the events in the City of Winnipeg website. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor, for your morning announcements. And now, on to Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I was very proud and honoured to represent Canadian Capital Cities for the City of Winnipeg. And we just finished hosting...host an event of people from across Canada that came to our wonderful city to really share and highlight some of the great work we are doing. The theme was Downtown Transformation. So, it was a really great event. I just wanted to highlight some of the things that people got to hear, the transfer...the transformation of Wehwehneh, the historic Hudson Bay heritage building, the addition of True North Square, and the plaza transformation of the Portage Place Shopping Centre, CenterPlan 2050; the panel discussion with Chief Daniels and Hazel Forrest, and we also have Kate Fenske and Glenda Gartner from True North Real Estate that were also helping us out for the conference. It was an amazing conference. And you know what, I have to say to me Councillor colleagues, every single day we deal with a lot of stuff that is not so fun to deal with. And it really kind of hinders us in some of the work that I think we do, right? But having to...been a part of this conference, I really see our city from a different light. Hear the passion from the organizers that are doing really great work in our community, our community organizations. And hearing the great work that our city is doing. They were very, very passionate. There was no political people intervening in what they were saying, and they were very passionate about the topics that they are working on. And it was really...it really made me fall in love with my city all over again. People were talking about how great we are doing. So, I just want to remind us because we are...I know we do not always agree around this room about the work that we are doing, but however, we all have a passion and love for this city and it is being recognized. So, I just want to thank everybody for that. And I also just wanted to provide you with a little bit of update on the UN Safe Cities work that I am doing. As Chair of the UN Safe Cities that looks at violence and sexual violence towards our women in public spaces. We...you know, we are trying to transform ourself. A lot of stuff during COVID has really hindered the work that we are doing. Thankfully, Council recognized that this work is important. We had a little bit of funding. So, we are...we are doing a scoping study and really working with our community partners that are on the ground working with women, or those that are perceived to be female and our young girls that are out there. I was walking in the streets down in our downtown, working with a group that is, you know, handing out food and providing services for people that are in need. I was shocked at the level of female youth that are out on our street. It really...it really shocked me. And the UN Safe Cities has seen an uptake in cities across Canada, across North America and now even within our European cities. So, now we have...we were the first Canadian...first Canadian city to be part of the UN Safe Cities and now we have eight across Canada. New York and Chicago has joined in. There is a need. And we are...as we are seeing more safety issues arising within our cities, we are seeing...we know that the number one thing we can do to protect women and girls, we are making our city safer for everybody. And on that, I do want to just mention the lives that were taken shortly of Morgan Beatrice Harris, Mercedes Myran, Rebecca Contois...I do not know if I am saying that right. Contois, sorry. And Buffalo Woman. And I just want to recognize that our work is not over. And I am very proud and honoured to be taking this on and hopefully I will be coming back to you with more of a robust plan in the future and we are undertaking that work right now. So, thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gillingham. Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. We have got a big agenda today. Let's move forward. We have two condolence motions before us today; for Merie Clara Purcell, mother-in-law of Mayor

Gillingham, and Terry Patricia Bergen, the mother-in-law of Councillor Chambers. The Mayor also remarked on the untimely passing of the Grand Chief Cathy Merrick. Thank you for that, Mr. Mayor. Madam Clerk, will you read the condolence motions into the record, please?

MOTIONS

Moved by Councillor Lukes,
Seconded by Councillor Chambers,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Merie Clara Purcell, Mother-in-law of Mayor Scott Gillingham, which occurred on August 25, 2024.

This Council extends to Mayor Gillingham and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Moved by Councillor Allard,
Seconded by Councillor Mayes,

THAT Council place on record its profound sorrow at the death of Terry Patricia Bergen, Mother-in-law of Councillor Chambers, which occurred on July 24, 2024.

This Council extends to Councillor Chambers and his family, its deepest sympathy and condolences in their bereavement.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Please rise if you are able for a moment of silence.

MINUTES

Councillor Lukes moves that the Minutes of the meeting held on July 18, 2024, be taken as read and confirmed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move into delegations. It is my pleasure to welcome Grand Chief Jerry Daniels of the Southern Chiefs Organization, and Jim Ludlow, President, True North Real Estate Development, who are appearing together in support of Item 3 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. It is regarding the Shareholder Approval for Sale of the Portage Place Mall Assets, Assignment of Related Skywalk Agreements and Financial Support for redevelopment of the mall. They are attending here in-person today. Welcome to you.

DELEGATIONS

Jerry Daniels: Thank you.

[Indigenous language spoken 10:07:38 to 10:07:43]

Thank you for that warm introduction of the project. Project 92 is a not-for-profit officially...is a not-for-profit...officially called TNSCO Housing 92 Inc. It is a partnership between True North Real Estate Development and Southern Chiefs Organization. Economic reconciliation is the cornerstone of Project 92. Call to action 92 coming out of the Truth and Reconciliation Commission of Canada. This project will lift many relatives out of poverty and provide meaningful jobs, as I have shared last time I was with you. I shared about how some of the people who are onsite at the building across, at Wehwehneh, had spoken about how it is...how many of the people there were in poverty, have dealt with addictions issues and how it is been a real opportunity for them to sort of restructure their lives and get stability into their lives. And so, that has been, I think, very important. And we will continue to sort of engage in the people who are working in that building. Our citizens living in Winnipeg, whether in the city or from our nations across the south, can find housing here. All profits will be reinvested into the property or used to build additional housing. The planned development includes access to a large-scale grocery store to improve food access in the downtown core. This project is more than good jobs. It is a place to live. It creates a critical foundation for a good life, whether that be a job or an education. Project 92 will be

a shining example of economic reconciliation and the value of establishing First Nations partnerships. Why we know all of this? Project 92 compliments SCO's Wehwehneh Bahgahkinahgohn project just across Portage Avenue connecting...connected by the Reconciliation Bridge. A multi-million-dollar project which is already creating significant long-term employment, including more than a million working hours during the construction phase. Wehwehneh will also include more than 375 housing units for families, post-secondary students, veterans, and culturally safe assisted living units for First Nations elders. Between the two projects, this is more than 550 new housing units in downtown Winnipeg. Project 92 sets the stage for meaningful economic reconciliation and will be the blueprint of future projects as corporations and businesses join us on the path forward.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Grand Chief. Mr. Ludlow.

Jim Ludlow: Thank you, Grand Chief. Good morning, Mr. Mayor, Councillors. Take a moment to reflect and reinforce Councillor Gilroy's comments this morning about the Capital Cities Conference. I was at that as well. Great conference, and the Grand Chief and myself spoke at it. But what was most impressive was what I was hearing about the City of Winnipeg. You know, we are often lost in what we do here and sometimes lost in what we reap. Sometimes it is not always positive. But the folks that were coming into the City of Winnipeg were telling us they wished they were here and they wish they were us. And they saw the projects and the work that we are doing in the city, specifically in downtown, and most of them were saying, how do we do that in our own city? We had some comments to all of them about, you know, Saskatchewan and Nova Scotia and football teams and the Blue Bombers and the Jets. And we went through all of that, and in the end, as we were reflecting on it, we feel very privileged to be here in the City of Winnipeg. We feel very privileged to have the professional sports, arts, entertainment, the many parts and the things that make the City of Winnipeg special. So, look, the Grand Chief and I and our respective organizations have come together on a major redevelopment plan for downtown Winnipeg that includes Portage Place and the Bay, very broadly speaking, that we believe produces, very unprecedented in many ways, social and economic impact for the City of Winnipeg. Our primary responsibility in this is the redevelopment of Portage Place. Our partnership with the Southern Chiefs Organization involves Project 92, which is a component of Portage Place on the west pad, which is a multi-family market affordable housing tower that is being built inside the organization, which is a component of our partnership, which is called TNSCO Housing 92 Inc. It is a not-for-profit. Our housing will be delivered through not-for-profit. The balance of the campus redevelopment includes neighborhood and wraparound services, parking, very significant healthcare delivery strategies for the Province of Manitoba. And we believe and we hope that you believe as well that it will be impactful for the downtown. We have very carefully studied the development. We very carefully looked at the alternatives. And we...frankly, that is what brought us to this table was the alternative, which was increasing vacancy, leading to potential closure. Of course, Wehwehneh, the Bay, had closed. Beautiful redevelopment plan for the Bay. Very, very responsive development plan for Portage Place vis-a-vis downtown. So, we think this is, of many things we are doing, one of the paths forward for Winnipeg that will touch on social impact, economic impact, deliver housing solutions, deliver health solutions, deliver neighborhood services solutions, and most notably, deliver people, density, activity moving forward and development. So, with all of that, and respectfully, we are here presenting to you with some optimism and some hope that you believe what we believe, and we can carry the day together and move forward in downtown Winnipeg. Thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will take any questions. Mayor Gillingham, followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you very much, Grand Chief, and Jim, both, for your presentation. I am just wondering...sorry about that, I am just wondering if either of you could talk just briefly about should...you know, should the approvals be in place, how soon this project can kind of be...commence. I know, Grand Chief, you are certainly well underway on Wehwehneh, but I am just wondering on this...specific to what is before us here. Thank you.

Jim Ludlow: Very good question, Mr. Mayor. Almost immediately. And I think we like to work backwards from what we think our delivery date is going to be. And we will tell you that the housing solution of the assets that are being developed in Portage Place will be the first tower that will be completed with occupancy we believe at the end of 2027. It is a...a current plan is 217 units with a mix of market and affordable, 40 percent affordable, including accessible.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next, Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And Mr. Ludlow, it is good to see you see again. Thank you. And Grand Chief Daniels, thank you for this. This is an exciting announcement. I am sure it will pass at City Hall unanimously. That on the heels of what the Mayor asked, it is similar to what I wanted to ask, which is, what I am hearing from the public is, we have given significant subsidies, government subsidies, we are doing more today, but what I am hearing from the public is, when are we going to see activity happening, not just on the Portage Place site, but

also the site known as the former Hudson Bay Building? When are we going to see the activity happening and results in terms of the significant public funding and subsidies that have been earmarked to these worthy projects?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Grand Chief?

Jerry Daniels: Well, I won't answer for Jim here about Portage, I think he made that one clear, but with Wehwehneh, we are looking at a soft opening for the 100th anniversary, which I think is in a few years. Roughly the same time, I would think, as Portage Place, or at least the tower.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Wyatt: And that would be the expected date of the opening of the grocery store that, I think, is quite exciting news for the downtown, I am assuming, is that correct?

Jim Ludlow: Yes. In fact, Councillor Wyatt, we, you know, in advance of today, we have done a significant amount at our site of, I will say predevelopment work, analysis, study, drawing, et cetera, with a view that, you know, when we get to the place where we get through days like this and get to the point where we are triggering on those option agreements that we have that we are essentially ready to move. At the point we do that, you know, it...time is valuable to us and time is money to us, so we would want to move very quickly. And as I said earlier, the housing asset is...it is...I will say it is an easier asset to build. It will come up more quickly than the health asset. But I have also spent time in Wehwehneh as well, inside the Bay, and there is lots that is going on inside the building that you cannot see on the outside and it is pretty impressive work that is currently underway in there at the moment.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Please during delegations bring all questions and responses through the Chair. Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, I am glad that something is going to be moving forward. Years ago, I talked to Jim August and he says, what are you worried about? I said, well, that thing...that building is not going to be very useful not that far in the future. Not 50 years, but probably closer. And it turned out that way and I am glad that True North and the Southern Chiefs are involved, Madam Speaker. My question is, the actual residential property tower is the not-for-profit entity. And I am just curious as to how does the...how do our proponents here intend to populate that not-for-profit board that will be overseeing the residential property?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Ludlow.

Jim Ludlow: At the moment, the governance structure, the board, is equally balanced. So, it is equal ownership between ourselves and the Southern Chiefs. And the board is equally structured, balanced 50/50 between ourselves and Southern Chiefs.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam...Madam Speaker. I did not get clarification. There is the medical phase building and then there is also the...there will still be a lot of businesses involved and stuff in the middle component I think it is, Madam Speaker. And I am just wondering, is that part of this overall renewal of Portage Place? Is that also not-for-profit or is that for-profit?

Jim Ludlow: No. Yes, no...So, in the end, we take the whole asset and consolidate it in to one title. There are two titles right now; the leaseholder and freehold interest. There is some complexity to it. And then, we subdivide it and carve it out into three separate asset classes. One will be housing asset class, which will be held by a not-for-profit. And the central core, which is central retail and parking, will be held by True North and be a separate asset class, which is the health asset class, which will also be True North. And True North, as you know, is a partnership here in Winnipeg between ourselves, the Richardson family and Thompson family in Toronto.

Councillor Eadie: My final question, Madam Speaker...

Madam Speaker: ...Thank you. Yes, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: My final question, Madam Speaker, I already know the answer, but I think the public should hear this, Madam Speaker. If...what is the not-for-profit going to do with any excess money that may result from operating it from year to year?

Jerry Daniels: Thank you, Councillor Eadie.

Madam Speaker: Grand Chief.

Jerry Daniels: I just shared it with my opening sort of statement about...they will be reinvested into housing and reinvested into the maintenance of the building and to additional housing. And so the plan, obviously, is to hopefully expand and continue to create more affordable...more housing for our people in downtown Winnipeg.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to the delegation this morning, community safety is something that I am acutely working towards improving, especially in the context of our downtown area. My question is to the proponent is, what elements are you incorporating to address downtown safety through the redevelopment of Portage Place? We see the investments that are going in at Air Canada Park to improve that gathering space. But from the concepts of crime prevention through environmental design and crime prevention through social design, what elements are you incorporating to make sure that gathering space is a safe space?

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Jim Ludlow: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. You know, we are deeply involved and committed to downtown safety, among other things, through the DCSP. So, all of the, you know, the fundamental design elements of the building point to people, population, lighting, security, cameras, collaboration. We have set aside a space in the Portage Place redevelopment plan, actually, for offices for DCSP, among other things. So, I think, you know, as the design continues to evolve it will be fundamental for us to be touching on all those points as we continue to, you know, collaborate through those components together in the downtown. I think the notion of density, of population, of reducing the vacancies, of opening up Portage Place as it is planned to do, creating, you know, more connectivity between the Central Park community and the south part of downtown all adds to the visibility, breathability and all of which sort of touches on the notion of downtown safety. Which is, you know, enhanced, among other things, just by people and density kind of thing. So, we are...appreciate the comment, very mindful of that, as you are, as the City is. I mean, it is one of those things, we live and work in downtown, I have been there for many, many years. Most of our investable assets at the moment are in downtown Winnipeg. So, it is critically important to us to continue on the path of, you know, improving what it means to be safe in downtown Winnipeg.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further questions, we thank you for your presentation today. Our next delegation is Mohammed Alli of the Order of the Knights of Rizal Winnipeg Chapter, who is joining us in-person in support of Item 5 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. It is regarding Welcoming Winnipeg – Adding to an Existing Marker.

Councillor Lukes: Madam Speaker, I would like to also suspend the rules to have Stuart Smith speak to Item No. 7.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Item No. 7 – The Ten Commandments Monument?

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: So, that would be suspension of rules for an additional speaker.

Councillor Lukes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Five minutes, no questions. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Mohammed Alli, welcome. And you are here today with?

Mohammed Alli: I am here today with Mr. Ray Sator.

Madam Speaker: Welcome.

Mohammed Alli: Good morning, Madam Speaker, Mr. Mayor, Council. We are here today for your support to unanimously give us the permission to put our marker at Dr. Jose Rizal's statute. I would like to thank the EPC, the Welcoming Winnipeg Committee and all that were involved in the process to getting this thing done. This is the last hurdle to get it done. And once this is done, we will be getting the marker coming from the Philippines. Of course, I would like to thank Councillor Vivian Santos for graciously helping us with this project and funding it at the same time. Also, I would like to thank Madam Speaker for her part in playing with the Dr. Jose Rizal Park, getting that done. It started already. Also, Councillor Mayor...Mayes for also giving us some funding to get it done. We are here for your support to get this project finished. And now, I will give you Ray to say a few words.

Ray Sator: Thank you, (inaudible). Good morning, my name is Ray Sator. I am the Chapter Commander of the Knights of Rizal Winnipeg Chapter. The Knights of Rizal is a civic and patriotic international organization. It is also a cultural, non-sectarian, non-partisan and non-racial organization which promotes the teachings of Philippines national hero, Dr. Jose Rizal. And among the Filipino peoples and others, who may believe in his teachings and to emulate and follow his example. So, as (inaudible) said, we are here today to request your support of the addition of the historical marker in close proximity of Dr. Rizal's statute located at Waterford Green Common, which is northwest of the intersection of Old Commonwealth Path and Dr. Rizal Way. And the marker will read, "Jose Rizal, Philippine national hero, born on 19th June 1861: physician, poet, writer, educator, linguist and inventor. Authored novels 'Noli Me Tángere' in 1887 and 'El Filibusterismo' in 1891 which bared colonial oppression of the Filipinos. He advocated nonviolent struggle for freedom but was charged with inciting dissent. The living soul of the 1896 Philippine Revolution, he was executed on the 30th December 1896. His martyrdom inspired a sense of nationhood that eventually led to the proclamation of the Philippine independence in 1898." And just to share that the people of the Philippines and Indigenous peoples of Canada share some similar experiences and generational impacts of white colonization. Both groups maintain their desire to decolonize and are on their own respective journeys. Honoring Dr. Jose Rizal with this new plaque not only calls attention of the fertile impacts of colonization around the world, but also recognizes the people who speak out against colonization. So, this new plaque is being gifted to the Knights of Rizal Winnipeg Chapter to demonstrate the death of Dr. Jose Rizal, influence and significance to the Filipino community as we have immigrated to other countries. This is a sharing of pride and culture. The Order of the Knights of Rizal Winnipeg Chapter is thrilled to be receiving such wonderful gift and would like to have this plaque added to the statute of Dr. Rizal that was dedicated in the summer of 2029...2020. And perhaps the first world class global Filipino, Dr. Rizal, was known and admired around the world. With his writing, supposedly, inspired Mahatma Gandhi and Martin Luther King in leading their own non-violent movements. This plaque marker, once installed, will put Dr. Rizal's statue in Winnipeg in the National Historical Commission of the Philippines official list of Dr. Jose Rizal's statutes around the world. So, again, thank you very much and we appreciate your support of this endeavour.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take any questions. No questions at this time. Thank you for your presentation today.

Ray Sator: Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation is Kelly Ryback, who is appearing in support of Item 6 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. It is regarding the General Council of Winnipeg Community Centers 2025-2027 Business Plan. And he is also in opposition to Item 9, regarding the Proposed Grant Intake and Review Process. Welcome, Kelly.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you, Madam Speaker, Council. It is a pleasure to be here today. The General Council of Winnipeg Community Centres with their three-year plan in support of. I want to say that I grew up in Crestview, and the Crestview Community Club on Morgan Crescent was the hub of the community. That if you had anything...if you wanted anything...something to do, you went to the community centre. And it was a life of sport that my parents volunteered at, me and my siblings participated in. It was incredible. But as Councillor Lukes said previously on this discussion, our community centres are structured under the '60s and that is no longer the case as there is competition now for leisure activity and sports is no longer centralized at the community centre. Hockey is no longer played and mostly not practiced indoors and the community centres have had to adapt. Some have done that, some have had challenge with that. I have been to several AGMs where two years ago, one community club did not even have a quorum, so they had to postpone their AGM. Some clubs have grown through amalgamation or just being in a new area and having additional facilities put in place, but we have created have and have-nots amongst our community clubs. The business plan is addressing to...for new programming, restoration, enhancements, and support. Two things that they address under their major...highlighted under their major issues. One was the implementation of online registration for sports activities and management through online. It was like 20 years ago, when I was on the St. James Hockey Board, and we talked about online registration. I successfully opposed it because I did not want to remove the experience of a young child with his parent going to register for a sport, meeting new people, meeting new kids, and taking away, not only that experience of meeting a new coach, but decreasing the visitation to the community centre. Sometimes you find out more just by

dropping in and seeing what is programmed or what is going on to develop an interest. The...and it decreases the number of volunteer hours. And I have volunteered many hours at my community clubs with me out there 20-below flooding the ice and things like that. But I am encouraged of the plans within this business plan to bring new organizations that have new uses within the clubs and have increased facilities. I am a member of Woodhaven Men's Shed. It is an incredible organization, it is part of a worldwide organization, that is started out at Woodhaven Community Club. So, we have to find ways to attract people to these locations that have more things going and return to being a big hub and...of the neighborhood community. I also encourage you that, if you are considering items for parks, that maybe you should consider the community centre. I was disappointed in this past year that, you know, St. James is getting a new spray pad, but it would have been wonderful if that spray pad had been at Bord-Aire Community Club. Another opportunity, you know, just where the greater...the Council can provide assistance and support to help the community clubs learn from best practices and pursue other opportunities for grants, et cetera. A second challenge that they have was just the minimum wage increases, that over a short period of time minimum wage has gone up over 30 percent. And that has its benefits, but also increases challenges that they had to decrease the number of centres that receive funding for janitorial services. And what I do want to identify is if you pass this business plan today, will it be outdated as early as 30-days from now when you go and speak on the living wage. That if the community centres are required to adopt a living wage, that is, be a funded organization, then this actually outdates this business plan, and have to go back to the drawing board or at least have to make a request for additional funding. But I do encourage you to support this plan, and hopefully it can lead to more opportunities for growth and to enhance our communities. Okay. The grant intake review process; I am listed as opposing it. Let me be clear though, I am not opposing the grants themselves or where that money goes, because they are very worthwhile organizations, et cetera. That...and I spoke on that at the July EPC meeting. It is just in the criteria that I would ask for some opportunity for improvement. And that is being, first just...there is a huge gap when somebody goes to request 25,001 dollar to 100,000 dollars on what they are required to provide. And it is not until you get to the 100,000 dollar grant that you have to provide accountant-generated financial statements. That all these organizations already have that. They have to submit to Revenue Canada. That these are...that I get concerned when you could say that the only criteria is internally prepared financial statements. The second part of that is that I just believe that gap of 25,001 dollar to 100,000 dollars is just too large for a certain criteria requirements. Now, I have submitted a written submission that you can find online. And that is it is two charts and all of that...it is about revenue and expenses and it is about compensation and other costs that the reason I provided that is, what you are asking is organizations to submit is already available online because they have to submit to CRA. And that information you can find out anything about the you need to know financial info of an organization just by quickly going online. You can see a quick view with pie charts and large categories or you can go into the detailed T3010 submission and get individual expense items for your evaluation. And I will also encourage that when these are being evaluated by the panel, the CAO, that regardless what the organization submits, that they go to this website within CRA, which is charities and giving, to be able to find this information and actually compare to what they submitted to make sure that it is accurate. So, I just...you know, is this...should this process be improved before you allow it or does it...after it is approved, is there opportunity for adjustments as you learn from growth? But I am also encouraged by, as Councillor Lukes has said, that this is going...could...opportunity for a wider range of organizations to get into these grants, because it has not been well publicized. And I will give you one example of Agape Table, which is now about...serving up to 1,000 lunches a day. That is almost double the quantity they were serving pre-pandemic. They receive zero government funding from all levels. Secondly, they only have three full-time employees. It is a machine when you go there. I encourage you to experience a morning of volunteering there. We go regularly and I...heads...my cap is off to those...to that organization. But it is just an example of a very essential public service that could benefit greatly by being a recipient of one of these grants. We are finding right now through recent volunteer experience that there...because the demand is so big, they have actually had to downsize the lunches they are providing. So, that is also encouraging as...and at the last EPC meeting, as Councillor Santos said, Madam Speaker, that the requirement is beyond the core and the inner-city. It is far-reaching to the perimeter. That there are areas of our community that are out in the suburbs that do require and benefit from the organizations that (inaudible) grant intake process. So, I am just asking you to reconsider the requirements in delivering this program. And also...and for, Madam Speaker, for the Council, do all you can to reach out to organizations that you think could benefit and are worthy of receiving a grant intake. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Are there any questions for our delegation? Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, the grants that we are talking about have been mostly related to, well, what I believe is related to City mandate, for the most part, in terms funds for recreation, art, type things, funding...the boxing program is keeping kids out of trouble. And there is many...Andrews Street Family Centre is working with...they ended up getting their grant because of the Core Area Initiative many years ago. One might say it was so long ago, but it served a purpose in the area. But Madam Speaker, I am just wondering if...well, maybe the public does not understand. One of the reasons that we looked at applying the money that was...is allocated in regards to many of those things. I have attempted to increase the overall budget so that we could include more organizations who are working at the things that really are more directly related to us. And I am wondering if the delegation actually understands it is because

we do not increase the budget amount for these very important services is the reason why you will find that they are only concentrated in the more difficult areas of our city.

Kelly Ryback: Yes, Madam Speaker, I understand. And I agree, there is more funding that is required. The need has exceeded funds available. And this is also a challenge before Council that...because it was not in the original budget, that reinstating 2.1 million dollars, just the fact of, where is that money is going to come from when you are challenged. But I would agree that it is a greater priority than what is budgeted today. And the other aspect of it that is...one, organizations either not knowing about it or because of misunderstanding, lack of knowledge or skillset or even time, they are not able to even create an application. So, that is why, you know, I just brought forward that CRA information that that could help make things simpler. But there...the need is greater than the budget, I agree.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Schreyer, your question.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank Kelly Ryback, again, for being here, for his insights over the years here. Couple of issues. One; he said that Agape Table, excellent place where I have visited and largely volunteered, receives no government contributions. Yet I am looking at as a registered federal charity, therefore, if I make a donation, I am steering my tax money which would go to the Federal Government. I am personally having the choice of steering my federal tax money away from there and towards Agape Table. And on that basis, I would consider it some sort of recognition by the Federal Government that...of some sort of contribution to Agape Table. Is it possible to see it that way?

Kelly Ryback: Well, you could. Madam Speaker, that would apply to every single donation ever made.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes.

Kelly Ryback: So, as my statement of Agape Table, and there are other charity organizations that receive from budgeted...budgets from governments receive zero dollars. Agape Table being one of them. Another one...and these are...I know of this because these are champions...these are charities that I champion and involved with. A second one, not necessarily applicable to the intake: Winnipeg Pet Rescue. Zero government funding. And there is several others and maybe...you know, there is many that fit the criteria of need that just either are not aware of it or just do not know how to establish the grant. I apply for grants that I receive. I run a program for vulnerable kids in St. James...through St. James School Division for a golf outing at John Blumberg Golf Course with my rotary club. We do other things, so it is...again, the need is huge. And this could open up the opportunity for others. And I, again, something that you are going to be faced...that Council is going to be facing next month, Madam Speaker, that I will go back to; if you adopt a living wage, this applies to this, as it is written. So now, money, as you know, it benefits the part-time employee of these organizations, it takes away from delivering the service to those who are in need of it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Kelly. There is a second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. And on that basis, some of those non-profits mentioned do not receive charitable donations and may be more eligible for direct government funding. In the meantime, Mr. Ryback also mentioned in terms of living wages here and how we deal with that with the City budget. Happens to be that in the last 30 years, some salaries that come directly from the City budget have gone up 10, 20 times in the last 30 years. Yet, when it comes to livable wages, could we not say that there are certain wages at City Hall that last 30 years that are actually a smaller and smaller portion of the budget, not a larger one like some salaries at City Hall, city budget, and that they are less livable wages than they were 30 years ago. That some of these jobs, these low paying wage...lower paying wage jobs used to be more livable wages than they are today. Meanwhile, some of the salaries have gone up 20 times and 10 times compared to the rate of inflation as 30 years ago. In other words, there is a big gap in terms of where the city budget, salaries and wages are going. Some of them have gone way up. Some of them have gone down. Some, such as these livable wages, at which to speak...

Madam Speaker: The question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: That is my question. And any comment by Kelly...Mr. Ryback.

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, the...that exists. That exists throughout all aspects of industry and commerce, not only government, of how wages are changed based on job description criteria or your executive or not. But the...you know, this is not intended to be a living wage discussion, it is just that for this program, that will be an impact to this program. That yes, and for the benefit for people concerned for poverty reduction program that benefits that employee, it will take away from front line services if that is implemented in a future discussion.

Councillor Wyatt: But it seems to me we are putting the concentration on the lowest wages of the city. Where we pay the lowest, and that is our concentration. We have not dealt with, we do not talk about here at City Hall where the highest salaries, those increases, and how they impact our budget. How they impact the taxpayer. And how they end up affecting livable wages with the city budget.

Kelly Ryback: Madam Speaker, just in response specific to that, and again, we are getting off topic, but I would welcome any executive and elected official wage freeze to benefit lower paid jobs and benefit any grants and reduce taxes or provide more services. Thank you.

Councillor Schreyer: Would we...would we...

Madam Speaker: That was three questions, Councillor Schreyer. Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, we thank you for your presentation today.

Kelly Ryback: Thank you everybody.

Madam Speaker: Our next delegation, Ed Hume, who is in support of Item 7 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. It is regarding a Donation of the Ten Commandments Monument. Welcome.

Ed Hume: Thank you. Good morning, Mayor Gillingham, City Councillors, my fellow citizens of Winnipeg. My name is Ed Hume and I am the organizer of the petition for Keep the Ten Commandments in Assiniboine Park. First, I would like to thank EPC for their recommendation from last week. We are very appreciative of that, and we feel that is one step closer to resolving this important issue of the 10 Commandment monument. The Ten Commandments are one of the oldest sets of universal values in the world which puts some limitations on human behavior. Jews, Christians, Muslims, all use the Ten Commandments for guidance. In fact, all religions, including secularism and atheism, whether formally or informally support them too for building healthy, harmonious relationships with family, friends and neighbors within society. The Ten Commandments form a basic standard of conduct for all humanity. Without it, anarchy and chaos would exist. Ten reasons why the Ten Commandments should be restored to the Assiniboine Park: 1) The status quo at the city...Assiniboine Park was upset. The Ten Commandments stood peacefully in a quiet, respectful area of Assiniboine Park, the formal gardens, for over 52 years. Probably 80 percent of people do not even know it was in the park. Then in the spring of 2017, it was put in storage to make way for the construction of the Leaf Diversity Garden. At that time, there were no complaints by the public to have it removed or petitions against it. Just the Assiniboine Park Conservancy, APC, and their board, a group of nonelected officials, made the decision to have it permanently removed from the park for no good reason. All they had to do was simply relocate the Ten Commandment monument to another quiet, contemplative area in the park. APC said they had no place for it. There is over 400 area acres in the park. In my opinion, APC blew it. They created a problem that did not exist. 2) Our petition is to keep the Ten Commandments in Assiniboine Park. The 1,526 online and paper petition signers want to have the monument put back into the Assiniboine Park, not just any park. The present recommendation from APC is too broad in scope. The monument could be put on private land available to the public, on public land anywhere in the city or put back in Assiniboine Park. Our petition calls for the monument to be put back in Assiniboine Park. 3) Assiniboine Park is the crown jewel of Winnipeg. It is the most suitable location for this monument. The choice of the Assiniboine Park for the placement of this monument could not have been a more ideal, providing access as it does for residents and visitors to have an educational opportunity for quiet contemplation of our past, present and future. Matter of fact, the original reason for the creation of the Assiniboine Park was for quiet contemplation and restful...restful relaxation. And that was established by George Champion, who used to be head of the parks at that time. That was the original reason for it. And we are saying that because of the original reason of the park, that the Ten Commandments is a perfect fit and needs to be restored back into the park. No. 4) Wisdom from the past. When Mayor Stephen Juba and his City Councillors accepted the Ten Commandments back in 1965, the fact that they chose Assiniboine Park demonstrated that they wanted it to have maximum public viewing for the citizens of Winnipeg. They were honouring the universal wisdom of the Ten Commandments, hopefully the present Council will do the same. 5) The givers of the gift really want the monument to remain in the park. The Fraternal Order of the Eagles, FOE, has always wanted the gift of the Ten Commandments monument to remain in the park. Darryl Lee, President of the Manitoba Chapter of FOE, in June 11th, '22 article in the Free Press said, "We prefer it remain in the park." And more recently at an EPC meeting on September 17th, President of FOE Aeries 23, Stewart Smith, the actual givers of the monument, not only wanted to see it...see it restored to the park, but hired a lawyer to help them protect and advance their cause to have it displayed in the park again. 6) The level of support. Presently we have a significant...we have significant public support to have the monument returned to Assiniboine Park. 1,526 signers, both online and paper petitions. A letter from the Jewish Federation of Winnipeg, and the Native Evangelical Fellowship of Canada, the Fraternal Order of (inaudible)...Eagles, and...plus we have some outstanding supporters like Gail Asper and retired Pastor Bruce Martin. On the other hand, what level of support did the APC have other than their own administration and their board to remove the monument? APC did not even send a representative to support their request at the September 17th EPC meeting. How serious are they? 7) Retired Pastor Bruce Martin spoke at EPC

reminding Councilors that the use of tolerance, diversity and pluralism are all good reasons for putting Ten Commandments back in Assiniboine Park. In a pluralistic society, you are always going to have some people disagreeing with each other, and that is okay. Tolerance is necessary to live in a multi-cultural society. Thus, a rich cultural diversity can grow when we do not take sides and seek to eliminate one group over another. 8) Historical value could be lost. The placement of the Ten Commandment monument back into the park is necessary to protect its historical and cultural value. Anything less would be diminishing this monument. In light of the...its intended purpose to have maximum viewing for those citizens who choose...and you do not have to, you choose to view it. This would also produce a diminishing public educational opportunity. 9) Offended Jews, Christians and Muslims. Restoring the monument to the same park would help mend the relationship between offended Jews, Christians and Muslims with the City and APC, who allowed this monument to be put in storage for seven years. And, finally, 10) Protect our freedom and safety. Ten Commandments were not given to restrict our freedom, but to safeguard it. That is why our whole legal system is built on it. Thus, we should be proud of the Ten Commandment monument and treat it with the respect it deserves. We need to put it back into the best public location it can be: the Assiniboine Park. In closing, the present EPC recommendation is definitely a step forward and we are thankful for that, but we feel the Mayor and the Councillors should be considering the following motion instead today. The Ten Commandment monument should be relocated back into the Assiniboine Park in a quiet, honourable, respectful area of the park. The City, Assiniboine Park Conservancy, APC, the Fraternal Order of Eagles and other supporting groups could determine the location within the Assiniboine Park. Seven years of disrespect in storage has been far too long. Thus, this work should be completed by the end of 2025. We would also respectfully ask the City Council to have a recorded vote today on this very important issue so that the citizens of Winnipeg would clearly know where you stand. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Ed. We will now hear from the next speaker, then we will take delegations...take questions. Our next speaker is Gail Asper speaking on the same topic in support. Welcome.

Gail Asper: Thank you. Good morning, Your Worship and Councilors. I am Gail Asper and I am a proud Winnipegger. And I have enjoyed visiting Assiniboine Park for my entire life, including lately on a daily basis. And I would really like to thank EPC for voting to keep the commandments in a public space. And I echo all of Ed's recommendations. And I want to say, kudos to Ed who was supposed to be in Toronto today at his granddaughter's birthday, but chose to be here instead. That is dedication. So, I profoundly hope Council will approve the EPC recommendation. And I also hope that Council can find a place in the massive Assiniboine Park to provide a home for the commandments just as Kildonan Park has a home for its commandments. My connection to the commandments arose when I was doing my usual job through Assiniboine Park and I used to always test myself if I could remember the commandments. And then, one day they were gone. So, I asked the park where are the commandments, and they told me they are gone because the Leaf is being constructed. But when the Leaf was opened, I asked, like, okay, where are the commandments, and they said, oh, they are not coming back. And they could not give me a good reason why. So, I started asking again and again and really never got an answer. Seven years have gone by and Councilors, never in my wildest dreams did I ever think it would take so much effort and be so necessary to explain why the Ten Commandments are a good thing to have in the park. The Asper Foundation website has received many thoughtful e-mails from strangers expressing their agreement and reminding me the commandments provide a moral compass for the world. A world which seems badly in need of such a compass. Assiniboine Park is a spectacular place for all Winnipeggers of different viewpoints and backgrounds. And since we are celebrating diversity in the park, perhaps an ideal place might be in the Diversity Gardens or they could compliment the Moses statute in Leo Mol Gardens. I have also been a long-time supporter of public art and was instrumental in bringing the Tom...John Hirsch statute to MTC. I was in charge of gifting the Lady in the Park to the English Gardens, and bringing the statute of Gandhi to The Forks. And I feel that public art is a great way to educate and inspire and I think that is true of this commandments monument. Now, some people have mentioned to me they do not feel comfortable having what they feel is a religious statement in a public park because we are supposed to have separation of church, synagogue, and state. But in fact, to me, the Ten Commandments are actually a 3,500-year-old set of values that were common throughout the Middle East. A universal set of moral precepts that are relevant to this day for all humans. Council members, you experience firsthand what happens when people break the commandments. You need more police to catch the murderers. You get small businesses closing downtown because of rampant, blatant shoplifting. Voters are turned off because they do not trust what politicians are saying because some politicians proudly admit they are lying. This is bad for democracy. People are taking stress leave because they are not getting their one day of rest, even. So, I asked myself what harm can come from reminding ourselves: do not murder, do not lie, respect our parents and our elders, give ourselves a day of rest and our employees, even our farm animals. And whether you are religious or not, I value the Ten Commandments as a way...as a reminder of the way humans should treat each other. And I value the inspiration they give me and others to be better people. And I also feel from an education perspective, it is important to know what the Ten Commandments are because they form a part of western culture. A part of pop culture even. And knowing what they are, I think, should probably be a part of everyone's basic education. I got e-mails referencing Charlton Heston in the Ten Commandments. Or for the younger set, the Prince of Egypt animated film. And Governor General award-winning Indigenous playwright, Ian Ross, reminded me of the big scene in Arthur Miller's classic, The Crucible, where the Ten Commandments figure prominently. So, why not have the park as a

place where people can become familiar with these highly relevant moral codes? So, in closing, I support the recommendation of EPC to keep the commandments in a public space. I hope City Council accepts that recommendation and directs the City Administration to find a place in Assiniboine Park. Contrary to Ed, I would urge Council to give the city a timeline of no more than three months to find a site and three more months to install the commandments. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: There will be no presentations from the gallery. Thank you. Questions? Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, Madam Speaker, through you to the guest speakers; thank you very much for your presentation today and thank you for your ongoing perseverance and patience on pursuing this subject, and for making this happen. Hopefully something will happen in terms of a public location. Was...has there any thought been given...you know, when you travel, especially throughout the United States, quite often in communities you will see the Ten Commandments on a statue. And quite often, they are outside of a town courthouse, right? And has there been any thought given to our court...our present-day courts which, is the entranceway with, actually, a big public arts structure there now on York Avenue. Any thought been given to that as a potential location, similar to...and I believe that part of the right-of-way there is City of Winnipeg right-of-way, that the courthouse has on their facility on the outside there?

Gail Asper: You know, we have been musing amongst ourselves where the best place is and where it would get the most exposure. So, my view is really, you know, exposure is good. I am...and maybe we could do a second one in front of the courts and also legislature. So, you know, could be on the legislative grounds; that is a beautiful site, as well. But of course, there is so many things in the (inaudible) that if people are going into the courts, they probably could have a little reminder. So, I would be supportive of creating a second set of commandments for the courts. But I also really do like Assiniboine Park. There are little things that just hit you if you walk by, especially for me, the day of rest is a big deal. That we are, you know, probably working on our cell phones as we are in the park, we probably just need to turn off the bloody phone and just be in the moment. So, here is for two commandments and I would be prepared to donate to that.

Councillor Wyatt: Okay, thanks.

Gail Asper: Any other questions?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Rollins, followed by Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Rollins: Good morning and thank you to both Ed Hume. For the record, Mr. Hume, happy birthday to your granddaughter. This Councillor thinks you should be in Toronto and online, but I digress. My question, Madam Speaker, is, fundamentally, have...you know, you have been to EPC, have you heard from Assiniboine Park? It strikes me as odd that such important community builders such as trustee...former trustee Ed Hume and Gail Asper has not heard from Assiniboine Park. Arguably, a devolved relationship with the City of Winnipeg, but a public trust and a public park, nonetheless. Talk to me about the communications that you have had that I might not know about since you brought this conflict to the public arena, to EPC and now Council. Talk to me about that. I am keenly interested if you have heard from Ray Karasevich or anyone at Assiniboine Park.

Gail Asper: Ed probably can talk...I know that I called, you know, years ago, called Margaret Redmond, who I know well. And she told me...was the one that told me it was not going back without really a reason. And then I called, of course, a few people I know on the board and bugged them, naturally. Everybody knows I like to bug people. And the people I spoke to were in favour, actually, of the commandments and they did not agree with the decision of them not being in the park. So, yes, that is...that is pretty much it. Oh, and then...okay then, you can talk about the Welcoming Committee.

Ed Hume: First of all, we did talk to...way back when, the first step we went to was to the park, or to the APC. Myself and my pastor, we went and asked them questions about this way back in about 2019. And the answer that we were given was that we do not want it here and that is it. And they were handling it like it was fully their monument. And then I told them that, really, that monument does not belong to you. The monument belongs to the City of Winnipeg; the Councillors, the Mayor and the citizens of Winnipeg. It was a gift to us.

Councillor Rollins: Second question, Madam Speaker, if I may. Do you think it is for lack of knowledge on your contact information that you have not in recent weeks, let's say in the last month, heard from the Assiniboine Park Conservancy? Did they not have your phone numbers, your e-mails or, you know, is there any outreach perhaps you have not done to update your contact information with the Assiniboine Park. And, perhaps, are you not accessible to all...I mean, I certainly know how to get a hold of both of you, but maybe they do not. So, is it possible that you have, you know, changed your contact information and they do not have it?

Ed Hume: No. In my case when I did approach them I left an e-mail. I was e-mailing Margaret Redmond on a regular basis and in contact with Bruce Keats, who is the manager of the park. They had all my information.

Gail Asper: And I get e-mails daily from Ray and talk to him and bug him about other things. So, yes. And donations are being made to the park. Constantly we are invited, we are major sponsors of the Babs Asper Gardens and what not. So, you know, no, they know how to find me for sure.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: Always good to hear an Arthur Miller reference. Though I do prefer 'After the Fall' rather than 'The Crucible' for sheer biblical illusions. But one quick...the comment, though, and I am glad to hear you say you are reaching out to Ray Karasevich. Duncan and I sit on the APC board. I have sat on there with four or five other Councillors over time. Margaret was a force of nature, of course, and Ray is doing well. But yes, certainly, I have heard more about this bloody issue at APC than the 55-million-dollar cost overrun on the Leaf. It is somewhat ironic we have spent far more time on this than on the cost overrun, but that is all in litigation. The comment I had...so, I did want to make it clear about, I do think the APC board, which has written a variety of e-mails to us about this, might disagree with some of the characterizations. And frankly, if we view APC still as part of the city, then that is good news for CUPE, man, because they keep saying it is really part of the city and then the collective agreement they have with the city should govern it. So, we should probably be a little careful about if it is really in or if it is out. So, it is out. There was, I guess, a comment made about the unelected board. Of course it is unelected. It is not Michigan. We do not elect university boards. We do not elect hospital boards...

Madam Speaker: ...The question, Councillor Mayes, thank you.

Councillor Mayes: So, yes, it is unelected, but Duncan and I...Councillors sit on that board. The question is, I would think the best argument you could make was that there is a totem pole there. Why have you not talked about that? That is probably the best argument you could make for your side.

Gail Asper: Okay, actually, I did forget. And of course, we only had five minutes for me. But yes, we have a beautiful totem pole. And I actually looked up the artwork on the totem pole and it is mythological, it is talking about Indigenous values. So, and it is celebrated. There was a big ceremony installing the totem pole. It is super prominent. It is fabulous and I welcome that totem pole. So, yes, we can learn from all of these things. That is my point about the education aspect, let's learn from all of these things. Let's not take them away and have nothing.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you.

Gail Asper: Thank you for reminding me of that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councilor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Really appreciate Gail and Ed being here today on, you know, in a sense, a rather serious issue. Surprisingly, it is pretty deep. Now, theology is not my strong point, never pretended. But I have got to say, having said that, I just never said it is my strongest point. But one thing I have never mentioned in my ten years here on Council, you know, over a period of decades, I have traveled around the world to dozens of countries on five continents. And I did get a sense of humanity. I did get a sense of our sociology and our...or even anthropologically because we have just talked about...Gail just talked about how deep this is, how far back this goes. Maybe pre-Judeo Christian...pre-Judaism. This is an expression of humanity that goes back a long time. It is ancient. This is our human nature and it is now expressed in words when we create societies and social constructs of law and order. These things are what create civilization. As we move forward and we learn from mistakes. And I would say, not only is this Judeo Christian, but I would say, maybe, the Abrahamic religions. Now, in this Council Chamber, we all say our prayers and I sing prayer from every religion here in this Council...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Question, Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: The question is, would we accept, given that it says, the first commandment: You shall have no other god before me. The question would be here, would we be expecting...would our delegates here accept and respect, therefore, for consistency and fairness, if there would end up being other religions who end up...

Madam Speaker: ...Thank you. Your question has been asked...

Councillor Schreyer: ...there at the park?

Ed Hume: Yes. We live in a pluralistic society, and...

Councillor Schreyer: Extension.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Ed Hume: Okay, we live in a pluralistic society where there is lots of different...and a multi-cultural society. And there is no reason why other groups and peoples can have things. There is no laws, I am aware of, in Canada yet that says you cannot have a religious...

Madam Speaker: Thank you...

Ed Hume: ...Monument in Canada...

Madam Speaker: ...Thank you for your response. Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, I want to thank the delegates for their presentations today. Appreciate that. Yes, I see there is others as well, but I want to thank the two of you for your presentations today. You would not know this, but just as...

Councillor Schreyer: ...I have not seen that yet today where someone's answer was cutoff. I was hoping for...that was pretty short. We have had longer answers all day today. Hoping they could finish their response.

Madam Speaker: I think they did respond...

Gail Asper: ...The only thing I would say is I would not want that, kind of the multi-faith, the idea of a garden holding up the installation of the commandments.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor, if you would like to continue.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, yes. Through you, Madam Speaker; just to thank you both for your presentations today. You would not know this, but I will ask it as an 'are you aware'. I did have a conversation in the last couple of days. APC did reach out to me. Certainly looking forward to, if it comes through, if we adopt what EPC recommended, looking forward to working with our interim CAO, Mr. Sherwood Armbruster, and APC to implement the intention of what EPC passed. So, I just wanted to make you aware of that. We have had good dialogue with them in the last 48...or 48-hours, three days. Also, just to reinforce, as well, thank you for putting on the record that the monument will be...is in storage, will be in storage until such time as it can be placed somewhere and worked out in such a way with the park and our interim CAO. And also, just to reiterate, that at no time was there ever any indication that the monument would be sent to a landfill or anything of the sort. It has always been in storage and will remain in storage until a place is found for it. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. And that concludes our questions under this delegation. Thank you for your presentation today. I did not have another individual on our list, did you? Okay. Just to clarify, that was the one that was suspended, so it would come at the end of all delegations. So, if you would like to just be in the gallery for the next five or ten minutes, we will get to that presentation. Thank you. Okay, you know what, just in the interest of time, you are down here, sir. If you could please come to the podium. Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: We support that call on your part. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Stuart Smith, please come forward. You will have five minutes on the clock. Thank you.

Stuart Smith: Thank you, Mr. Mayor and Council. As a proud Métis from the Waverly area, I thank Councillor Lukes for the exemption to allow me to speak. For 125 years, the Fraternal Order of Eagles Aerie 23 has been helping the needy citizens of Winnipeg and hopefully will continue to do so for the next 125 years. Again, thank you for your support. Eagles Aerie 23 want the citizens of Winnipeg, visitors from Canada and abroad to observe and envision the monument installed in 1965 as a donation be replaced to City Park. Return is not wanted. I did...I do recognize Mayor Gillingham's remarks that there has been changes in the last 48 hours. So, I thank you very much for everything that might happen here towards this. I did not hear, but there was a reference to Gail Asper asking if they had spoken to City Park. A name I do not know how to spell, Sherri Rollins asked about Kenneth Salvage. I did get a phone call at...during this meeting two weeks ago when we presented and he...I had never spoken to him, but he was clarifying why the Eagles wanted

the...or he was surprised when I said we did not want it back. We wanted it to go, but we were only told, originally, that if it was not picked up it was going to be disposed of. So, I am not sure. It was a very brief conversation. But he was quite concerned when I was explaining these things. But I do not know who the gentleman is. But, yes, he did call me. I thank you very much.

Madam Speaker: Thank you for your presentation. Thank you. We will now move in to the next delegation, Kate Kehler, in support of Item 9 of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. It is regarding the Proposed Grant Intake and Review Process. Welcome.

Kate Kehler: Thank you. Good morning, everybody. Apologies for the members of EPC, you will be hearing a lot for the second time, but not everything. And hopefully, you all had a chance to review our correspondence from yesterday and all got the updated report that we sent. And I had actually did not know I could not do a presentation today. Ten years at Social Planning Council and I did not know I could...I could not do one at Council. So, you won't get the slide show. All right. I am here on behalf of a very broad coalition of organizations, some that are currently funded by community grants and others who are not but understand the potential ripple effect of what you decide to do with this vital program. Thank you to those we have been able to meet with and also to the back and forth that we have had with people we could not meet with. Also, thank you for your responsiveness in reconsidering what impact the City's report and draft by-law on the program will have on this sector and those they work to serve. We certainly appreciate the commitment to return the full 3.4 funding...3.4 million funding level. Likewise, the proposed amendment by Councillor Santos that passed at EPC of the removal of the two clauses that would prohibit operational expenditures from being eligible. However, after meetings with some of you, grant project officers, as well as the interim CAO and CFO, we are now very concerned with the stipulation that makes any expenditures prior to approval also ineligible. We did not raise any objections to this clause earlier because it is quite standard. However, given where we are in the process, we now have to be. The currently funded programs need to have confirmation of funding by December. With confirmation, they will work to manage cash flow until City funds flow. This is pretty standard. However, if you do not pass your budget, and we do realize that you are still waiting to hear from the Province, at least to the point of confirming what is available for community grants and guaranteeing the organizations that those funds will flow in the new year, they will have no choice but to lay off people. Even if that clause was also removed, it still would not serve. Organizations do not typically have funds or resources that they can gamble with. They must spend alternate funds...they must spend alternate funds on what they promise that funder. They cannot rob Peter to pay Paul. Apparently, we are big on the bible today. We were...we are told that the earliest the draft budget will be available is December 11th, we are now September 26th. In the interim, we were told the City staff must devise a new process and while it has always been an open process, a concerted effort is to be made to get new applicants, as well as the previous grant applicants and then, do a fair and transparent evaluation of each and every application. We are told that this is pretty well unworkable, but even if it can be done, it will be chaotic and it will still have an immediate destabilizing effect on the sector. Current grant recipients as good employers are going to have to be straight with their staff. They are going to have to warn them that their jobs are at risk. They are also going to have to warn participants that their program is at risk. Staff will look for new jobs. They have to. They have bills to pay. Participants are going to be left feeling abandoned as organizations may or may not be able to meet their needs or refer them to someone else in this short of time period. While losing funding was always a potential for these programs, they could at least be confident that there had been time for due consideration, as in their applications fully vetted as well as their annual reports demonstrating that they have met deliverables were fairly reviewed. And if unsuccessful, they would be given enough time to adjust. At this time, the concern is that in an effort to have other organizations gain access to these funds, different or new will be prioritized over tried and true. We all know that different does not always mean better. And as we have pointed out, if a program is doing what it said it would do and is doing it well, why should it be cut? If the concern is that all city wards must have equal share, then we will have to disagree. An equitable share? Sure. But while there are pockets of poverty throughout the city, we all know where it is most concentrated. If one of these SPAT priorities is the downtown, then moving money to the suburbs does not make sense at this time. If Councillors do want to see certain services in your wards, why not approach the organizations already doing that work and work with them through either ward budgets or other funding opportunities so they can extend those services to your ward or, of course, find more money for the grant program. The sector collaborates all the time. We do combine resources and form partnerships. Community centres, which do need to be funded directly from Community Services and not through community grants, are spaces where other organizations can and do provide programming such as art. Of course, not all the current grant recipients are focused on poverty, but as far as I can see, they build inclusive, healthier community through a variety of means. We said at EPC that our report cover is not meant to be a picture of a bread line, but one that demonstrates nurturing. This is what community grants do. They nurture and deliver on the City's chartered responsibilities to look after the health and wellbeing of its inhabitants. Please note, our report only has 14 of the 39 currently funded agencies who are able to participate over the summer. So, I will just read the stats instead of being able to show you. Art City, multiple sites, over 5,000 participants. Age and Opportunity, throughout the city, almost 10,000 older adults in their Senior Centre Without Walls. BGC, 28 locations, multiple programs and over 75,000 snacks or meals served. Graffiti Art Gallery, two locations, multiple outreach events a year with over 16,000 visits from youth. Green Action Centre provides education on the environment with over 10,000 hours of community outreach. Main Street

Project, throughout the city with over 109,000 community contacts. Mediation Services, throughout the city, taking 250...250 to 350 community-related calls, 25 percent of which are direct referrals from City staff. MTYP has one main location, but available to all interested, plus does workshops and performances throughout the city. Their most recent numbers are 186, reaching almost 45...4,500. RAY, an essential outreach service with almost 15,000 contacts and distributing harm reduction supplies, such as 4,343 narcan kits. Save Our Seine, protection of the waterway and clearing of dangerous log jams and downed trees; 15 of each, most recently. Spence Neighbourhood Association builds belonging for youth and its drop-in WE24, arts and sports programming. If there is a need that you can name, they will try to meet it. Trees Winnipeg distributed 5,492 discounted trees to property owners and 72 trees were planted at 25 elementary schools. And here, the map, if it was up there, we would add in the Broadway Neighbourhood Centre and Rossbrook House, both of which are situated in the centre of the city's highest poverty areas and provide essential services where they are most needed. Again, this is just 14 of the 39. So, if the map was up there and we had them all in there, it would be quite...it would be a mess. You would not be able to read it. So, having once again pointed out how essential the services that just some of the current recipients provide, we have a further ask. As long as the currently funded organizations complete their applications properly and have all their reporting up-to-date, then it is status quo for 2025. As in, those who are currently funded receive their 2024 funding amount for 2025. This will still amount to a cut given inflation, but it will at least allow them the time to adjust and plan for next year while maintaining essential services. This will also allow City staff to devise and implement a fully transparent grant intake and evaluation process, hopefully, in partnership with sector representatives. We understand that there has long been a desire to overhaul the community grants by some on Council. However, the process was undertaken, as the City's own report demonstrates, without giving any consideration to how not just the organizations will be affected, but their participants and the sector as a whole. Thank you and happy to take questions.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for our delegation? Councillor Schreyer and Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not think any politicians, well, not many really want to do this. So, why is this happening is the question. And we have to ask ourselves the question, you know, considering the fact that we have raised every tax, fine, fee, levy and rate. We have spent or we have depleted our financial reserves. We are borrowing more money, selling more debentures, and yet, we are still...and we have already been doing cuts. Do you feel that City Hall has done a good job to the taxpayers in explaining how it is that we are looking for further cuts, even though we raise every tax, fine, levy and rate and fine. We have depleted our financial reserves, we have done other cuts, we are selling more debentures, we are going further into debt. Yet we still have to do this. Do you think...do you think City Hall has done a good job in explaining that?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Kate?

Kate Kehler: I am not actually sure how to answer it. I think a lot of people...what I have said here before and how I feel and other people feel about taxes, is they do not mind paying taxes, they really do not, as long as the money is being well spent. A lot of times I would liken that directly to conversations we have had about safety with private business owners and things like that. And they will say, they do not mind paying taxes, but they want...they want to see the results. And we then get into that conversation, does that mean police or does that mean, you know, the Community Grants Program and all the work that those folks do by...in providing safety? So, they want to see results would be my only answer to that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. We have raised taxes. We have spent our...but we have also spent our reserves. We are selling more debentures. We are already making other cuts. Do you think that aspect, besides the fact that we have been raising taxes, we also have raised...we use our water rates to go into general revenue. We use our water rates as a tax. These things, have these things, besides the tax increases; have these things, do you feel, been expressed well by City Hall to explain after doing all of that, we are still looking at making further cuts?

Kate Kehler: I think you would have to do a poll on that. I really...I do not have an answer for you on it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question is Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, I have a few questions here. So hopefully I can get them all asked. Firstly, do you know that with this money going back to the budget, this is not being money...you still have to fight for it. This is going back to Budget Working Group. So, this really...when they said that they were going to not do those cuts, the cuts are happening, unless that is...it is done on the floor today.

Kate Kehler: Our understanding is there is a commitment to it and that there has been somebody tasked to find that additional money. But it has not been found yet, that is our understanding...

Councillor Gilroy: So, I just encourage you to keep fighting that because it is a budget working group and anything goes in the budget working group. The cuts were not restored...now, the cuts...I also want to talk a little bit about there was asks at EPC and none of them has been really granted. Some of the asks was that, not only with the funding that we just talked about, but that there was no political interference in the decision making. There is ask for this be put with the multi-budget process, which would...

Madam Speaker: The specific question, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Are you aware that EPC did not do any of the recommendations. One being that you have asked for no political interference in this process. Two, that...the...sorry.

Madam Speaker: The question's been asked, I think. Thank you. Would you like to respond?

Councillor Gilroy: Okay. Okay, and then I will let her answer.

Kate Kehler: Yes, we are aware that those did not get in to the changes that were made to Councillor Santos' amendment. We are still hopeful that that can happen, but if we are in a time crunch...And right now we are more focused on the money more than anything else. And hopefully this process unfolds and we can adjust it if we need to later.

Councillor Gilroy: And my last question is, with the continuation of the General Council of Community Centres and other grants that, really, we are obligated to be doing with those inclusions, if there is any funding cuts you will have to...your organizations will have to fight for that funding against core organizations that are doing core services for the City of Winnipeg. Are you aware of that?

Kate Kehler: We are hoping very much that that can be avoided, which is why we want the community centres to be funded differently. And just to mention, that they are...they are in support of this coalition as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you to the delegation; do you believe that there should be an evaluation framework or metrics to evaluate the work done through these grants that are issued so that on an annual basis the grant money that was issued demonstrates the work that is been done within that funding year?

Kate Kehler: Absolutely. But what I am told of from the organizations that get these, they report every year. And their reports are reviewed by whomever is in charge of their grants, their officer is the person who reviews it. They get sent up the ladder, but seems like they do not get far enough. We do not understand why not. But I know Eddie Ayoub has been here and he said, I would be happy to come here every single year and show you a wonderful slide show. Not at Council, but at EPC, I guess. So, that is...there is...none of us have any issue with having our work evaluated. But it has to be done fairly and transparently.

Councillor Chambers: So, the evaluation, would it be qualitative, quantitative?

Kate Kehler: It would be both, I would imagine, because, you know, there are certain things that if you are, say, public safety, if you are working with very sort of low-risk folks, you can work with a lot more of them. When you are working with higher risk folks, you have to be far more concentrated. So, it could not be, you know, comparing two organizations and only, you know, they work with a certain number and another organization works with a ton of numbers, you would actually have to look at qualitative part of that as well.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councilor Orlikow.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you very much. Thank you for being here today and your continued diligence on this file. And unfortunately, I do...I have looked at the idea of...ideas of how we can put the money into play right now. But I am a big proponent, unless I know where the money is coming from, an easy thing that I have been doing is just calling first call on the budget, but I could not figure out where I could find that 2.3 million in the timeframe. So, that option was not there. So, but I did hear, and Councillor Gilroy approached me on it and I just want to get your feedback, the political

nature of the evaluation committee. There was a movement to have three Councillors on it; two from SPC and a chair...a speaker. All lovely people. Again, we are not talking about people, we are talking about positions. Well, again, then it got me thinking politics again. So, I felt that political, well, why them, not us? And who are they and stuff. So, we put a motion forward, Councillor Gilroy and I, to actually get politicians out of that evaluation process. Is that something you would support?

Kate Kehler: Yes, we thought it would better if there were not to be any politics. They have the control over the budget, obviously. You are the ones that determine the overall budget. That is your oversight on it, but it should actually be grant officers.

Councillor Orlikow: Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Lukes: Thank you. I just wanted to put this on the record as a 'did you know'. Did you know that all of these grants, all of these grants, were political grants to start with? And that is where...that is why we are here today because...because they were all political decisions that were made me members on EPC. Many around the table have not sat on EPC or been part of EPC to offer up influence to secure political grants. And that is what they are, they are political grants. And I am not sure if you know that. And that is why we are here. Because there has not been equity, and we talk about equity...

Councillor Eadie: ...Point of order, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, she is not stating fact. Is the Winnipeg Housing Rehab Corporation, do you think that that was just some...one Councillor's decision to make...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie...

Councillor Eadie: ...to provide a grant?

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie...

Councillor Eadie: Are the Winnipeg Public Library boards listed in here? Is that...is that...

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie, order. You will have an opportunity to ask a question.

Councillor Eadie: It is not the truth.

Madam Speaker: Kate, would you like to respond?

Kate Kehler: I could answer that I am aware of some of them being political, the will of. We mentioned JUST TV as an example last time when I was here at EPC. That was a program that was saved by Mayor Katz because they were being...a vital program was going...five vital programs were going down the tubes because the Federal Government refused to support them. After they proved all of their deliverables, by the way. So, yes, we are aware of some of them were that way. And again, Eddie Ayoub has been here, other people have been here. We are not opposed to an open, transparent process. Not opposed to...but it is the timing of it right now. Nobody expected this large of a cut at this point in time. It is September, and December is coming soon, and they are looking at having to lay people off.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councilor Orlikow? Any further speakers? Seeing none. Oh, Councillor Mayes, yes. So, Councillor Schreyer moves extension, two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. He is not in the line for questions, just had a comment. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, good points about the reduction in funding, which remains unconfirmed or controversial. I get...I just find it odd the context around, well, we would not want politicians who were elected by the public making any decisions about how the budget is spent. I am pretty damn proud that I got the Save our Seine grant and I got it in because I got on EPC, quite frankly, and I apologize for none of that. Secondly, there is a terrific grant that has nothing to do with my ward, to U of Winnipeg for inner-city work study. It will probably be cut because, well, last year I was told by one of the staff who had left to work with the Province, there was, "no way this was going to get approved because the City of Winnipeg staff no longer supported it." To Browaty's credit...to Browaty's credit, he said no, we should do this one more year, at least, then we will have a whole different evaluation. So...

Madam Speaker: ...Councillor Mayes, the question.

Councillor Mayes: You know, I am pretty proud that I got some money for an inner-city program like that. That is a reconciliation project. Shame on me for being a politician and not just leaving that to the staff, I guess. But I ran on it. Proud to do it. So, can you just sort of clarify what your view is in terms of the openness and transparency that would be part of the process?

Kate Kehler: Well, I have to tie that into your comments about the political oversight of it. It is...the concern would be, is the even the perception of bias. It is very difficult to not look at that. I have told folks, not here, the story of when I was at the John Howard Society. We had a particular Member of Parliament and he objected to a protest having taken place in his office. This person is Pat Martin, I can name him, it is on the public record. As a...and would say that he was a labour activist, but he very much objected because there was a protest and, actually, it was not against him, it was actually against Minister Swan, at the time, on the Bill C10 business. He objected to that protest happening and called my boss in order to complain about that protest because he thought I was there. I was not, actually, but he thought I was. So, I thought that was very odd. And he was my Member of Parliament, so I contacted him directly and said, why are you objecting to my...why are you trying to cost me my job? And we never got a Canada Summer Grant after that. So, can I say that he did that? No, of course not. He had to sign off on them, but I can say...I can look at that and I can say, that is biased. I do not think politicians would want that sort of level of...would want that perception, would be my question on that. So, transparent and fair is an evaluation process where you are very clear about what you are applying for. Right now, actually, any of the grant recipients that I have spoken to...

Madam Speaker: ...Kate, we have timed out...

Kate Kehler: ...Oh, I am sorry...

Madam Speaker: ...For this item. And thank you for your presentation.

Kate Kehler: Okay. Alright. We will follow up afterwards.

Madam Speaker: Next is Alanna Phillips who is appearing before Council in support of Items 1, 4, 6, 7, 9, 18 and 20 all of the report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th, 2024. Alanna is with us today, welcome.

Alanna Phillips: Mayor, Council, Speaker. Sorry, I was here the other week and was last, so. I would just...I would like to...ten minutes. Okay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Welcome, Alanna.

Alanna Phillips: Thank you. Make sure I have everything here. So, addressing all of these issues, I am bringing up a new form of infrastructure that will allow us to do re-zoning and bring funds up front, bring...lower the rate of criminality within our city and thus, our country, et cetera, et cetera. Just talking about the 120...24, about the vacant buildings. And the boarding of the houses and the buildings. Vocational housing needs to meet the needs of specific communities. Can include urban forest preservations via sustainable, Indigenous and planetary conservation designs, resolving conflicts that is essential to meeting healthy city planning models. Laboratorial student housing, live-in tutorial housing portals, interactive housing portals, interactive laboratory portals, universal vocational portals, indiscriminate education, employment tasks, laboratories that can be moved as the schools need so of that these...it brings down the costs and allows for all the students to have optimum education without increasing the cost of having to get every school with these facilities. Provides goods and services to both their local and international communities, responsible, responsive sustainable, local, foreign and tourism development. Also, we can learn about grapes by actually living in...having art and Community Services provide architectural models and design that allow us to live in a grapevine or in a mistletoe see all the cell walls as you walk down the hallways. Constructing vertically with...in (inaudible) facilities, the service of large members on small spaces, collectively, vertical structures can become the I-beams for other scaffoldings, for domes, planetary logistics. Houston has a dome, you can look up mega engineering projects and I think we should be in competition with them. Building horizontal, however, connects the services as well as increasing those services. Building horizontal infrastructure can meet the needs of our social logistics such as connecting hospitals, allowing our emergency responses to not have to navigate through traffic. Fires can be extinguished remotely from such logistic grids. Evolving our hydro infrastructure, owned by the people of Manitoba, for example, can allow for shut-ins to be mobile, persons with disabilities to not have to navigate weather, often dangerous urban life to maneuver in and out of transit buses or buggies. Meeting global needs with responsibly connecting our communities, including horizontal zoning facilities in every future project will reduce cost, raise the quality of life for all and will facilitate all requirements for a happy, healthy, safe, vibrant urban community to grow and prosper as the agenda of our collective western Mayoral palace is respected. Poverty reduction, inclusive urban planning, vocational student housing, climate action apprenticeship, aerospace technology, advancing urban and rural communities, engineering architectural design. Three...Item 3. Upgrades and extensions via vocational student...student laboratories and...oh, sorry, I have this mixed up. Student housing. Private

sector, large corporations, small business alike can be involved. Student housing faculties benefits individual students, the public sector, infrastructure provisions through which continuous vocational training provides by vocational, education laboratories. By mobile vocational education laboratories, we can have the maintenance and advancing of infrastructure continuously evolving. When the student is ready, the City can afford to facilitate; a win-win for all, and a win for all is a win for one. The City can build their own infrastructure upgrades that not only facilitate optimum resources for Portage Place to facilitates the advancing of our entire downtown community preparing for decades and future millennia will allow our city and our global communities for optimum preparedness. Where are we? Eight: Sustainable food service cooperative infrastructure rehabilitation development between public and private sectors, indiscriminate accessibility, evolutionary infrastructure and transportation, environmental disaster, development, urban farming, aerospace research, universal defense research, universal housing security, universal income security, universal sustainable development, optimum emergency response, wildlife rehabilitation such as Omand's Creek, which can paramount West Edmonton Mall, ecological urban development, sky lighting, carbon capture, student professional collaborative economic development, sustainable tourism, reduces overhead expenditures for retail and services, indiscriminate vocational education, indiscriminate employment security. Creating comprehensive sky walking infrastructure that grows our logistics, building vocationally state of the art carbon capture, urban garden paths throughout our downtown community extending outwards from the city centre to our rural neighborhoods. Complete communities, housing faculties, subsequent infrastructure, logistic produces optimum services and care, indiscriminate for all citizens. Including innovation in this...in these designs, we can transform surplus materials into sustainable advancements as opposed to being held back by uninvolved...un-evolving economies. Considering By-law No. 102, budgets can be utilized for vocational training education that increases individuals participation and production opportunities. Leisure meets urban development and tourism, inclusion.

Madam Speaker: Alanna, your presentation may also be on the record, perhaps, at another committee.

Alanna Phillips: Okay.

Madam Speaker: And they are videotaped. They are videotaped, just so you know.

Alanna Phillips: Yes, thank you. Airspace and public...sorry, lots of time. Air space and public spaces shielding our city from elements. Climate variations via crime reduction. Transportation, high tech advancements, we can reach together the best healthcare services on the planet while reducing and/or eliminating three level debt sinkings. Housing facilities...housing faculties. Horizontal building logistics meets all the goals by End Homelessness. This with funding from both federal and provincial governments through vocational housing initiatives include secondary suites on public and private spaces. Affordable housing does not have to be a hand out. This project...protects...this can protect our citizens from all sorts of power and landfill disasters. Acres of solar panel supplies via carbon reduction initiatives from the feds can, along with upgrading our bulk and waste services, upgrade our urban hydro infrastructure, providing essential utility compact hardware that we can make zoning more simplified for communities; urban centres to suburbia, allowing individuals and large corporations and governments to better produce immediate housing in order to literally end homelessness. Nine: the grants dispersed in the form of education and training costs, upgrading education administration versus grants from...for respite for homelessness. One is a money pit causing staff burnout, the other provides responsible partnership between citizens and our individual housing options. Six: Housing faculties eliminates...oh, alleviates financial and housing struggles allowing community centres to provide recreation, leisure and supports. Consider also mobile tutorial spaces that can be delivered to community centers and schools upon request, including transportation upgrades. Meeting the needs of optimum healthcare services will certainly increase leisure and cost effectiveness. More importantly, our global...oh, wait. Here. Initialization of connecting transports from communities relying upon Winnipeg via green spacing, that will be continually maintained. More importantly, our global community can be encouraged to follow suit and Winnipeg can take the lead if we have collective and initial will. The western agenda. Seven: If the western agenda, specifically the Mayoral palace, is the common interest of joining peaceful communities, promoting independence via our individual freedom to reach the highest quality of life without sacrificing others into the extortion of indulgence, administration, the ten commands of truth are the safest pathway. To answer your question, Councillor Schreyer, is Deuteronomy is...is god is love. Love is truth. So it is a synonym...

Madam Speaker: ...Alanna. Alanna. Alanna, your presentation will be brought through the Chair. That is myself.

Alanna Phillips: Right, okay. To piece...the ten commands are true...of truth are the path, safe way...safest pathway to peace. In other words, to truth for reconciliation, one for all, all for one. And record keeping infrastructure, number eight, that provides foundation for future infrastructure sites. Time capsules can be a logistics. 11 to 18, all subdivisions and rezonings need meet most advanced provisions for future additions and maintenance that should include...

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Alanna, that concludes your time. We will now take any questions if there are any. Seeing none, thank you for your presentation today...

Alanna Phillips: Thank you...

Madam Speaker: It is your first time presenting at Council. I invite you to connect with our City Clerk's Department on our processes for future. Thank you...

Alanna Phillips: Wonderful. Thank you...

Madam Speaker: Council will now break and reconvene at 1:30 p.m. If I would invite the Councillors to join Mayor Gillingham in the foyer for the Council photo right away. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 26, 2024, at 1:55 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of September 26th, 2024. We are still in the delegation section. Next up is David Grant who is appearing remotely on a number of items, as listed on the delegations page on your agendas. Mr. Clerk, do we have the delegation online? Yes, I do see him.

David Grant: [Feedback from video]

Madam Speaker: David, could you...yes, thank you. Just turn that off. Welcome to you, David Grant.

David Grant: Okay, thank you. Yes, that was unfortunate. I had YouTube open looking for their return. Yes, back to the topics at hand. On housing, topic four for EPC: This report lists new units, but fails to report the number of unit per lots and why no one can live there now. Sorry about that. Some were destroyed by fire, obviously, and some are declared subpar and closed by the City. This data should be tracked and reported to tell the whole story. The report suggests building new rooming houses. It is silent on the conversion of existing houses to the rooming house model. This process is centuries old and, I believe, should be encouraged. I believe that the new residential units provided by the City will meet applicable standards. The City is very careful about that. I suggest that they be constructed to a higher standard, one with high levels of isolation between units. If you listen to the customers, folks who...including the folks living in encampments, when they are interviewed on TV, you learn that many prefer a tent to their last indoor accommodation. Being able to move away from bad neighbours on a whim is fairly simple and it is a good reason. That is one that is been expressed. We hear also that the tent tends to be free of bugs. That is another reason. I suggest that adequate gasketing be required by standards where wires and pipes and people enter the units. The heating in it should also discourage the migration of bugs. We need new standards. It generally...on topic eight, generally, this is a good report. Please ask staff to consider my notes that are in your agenda for the record-keeping when people change jobs or leave. On topic 20, human rights: When this committee was first proposed it seemed like a good idea to advise Council on any violations of our rights. In the years since then, it has lost track of that purpose. Its reports are completely silent on actual human rights violations involving City Hall. It has become simply a place to advocate for diversity targets. They ignore...the targets ignore the fact that folks in some demographic groups have preferences that differ from that target. This committee has now committed to the violation, they declared this, of some basic rights of the people in Winnipeg. For this and other reasons, you should consider remaining it the DEI committee of Council. DEI is certainly a noble cause and to recognize that you have a group of able people working on this cause would be a good thing. You are all committed to transparency in plain language. This change would help fulfill those promises of plain language and transparency. On Property, topic one: Winnipeg has too many rules that serve no purpose, in my opinion. I have brought it up here before. Examples are in your agenda. We usually adopt building standards soon after they are approved by higher levels of government. Winnipeg has always trusted those levels. In this agenda item, it seems that you no longer trust the building code. Items dropped by Manitoba by consensus are being added into a custom-made Winnipeg building code. Instead of making rules for the pools, why...like the rhyming, why are there no rules to make new rental suites resistant to the migration of pests? Do your development staff who are involved with this stuff not know of this need? On Property, topic four: this agenda item makes reference to Bills 34 and 37. When you look at the Manitoba website you find that those bills include no wording involving the City, the City Act, or City powers. Given to that any further there is much more on your agenda than I have written. On topic five: There is widespread dissent of the...I am sorry. Since we expect widespread dissent as development is rapidly approved and the former living standards rules are thrown out, it is inappropriate, in my opinion, for Council to be the arbitrator of the fairness of it all. On topic six; infill: For decades, we have all been taught that the smallest changes in what are called community livability attributes will not be allowed upon pain of heavy fines for the smallest transgression. Now, at the suggestion of some anonymous Ottawa bureaucrat, houses can now be destroyed, many parks can be torn up and replaced with apartment buildings peering down on our homes from as far...as much as four-stories up. No one at City Hall was elected specifically to do any of

this. This is a violation, in some ways, of the principles of democracy and good government. For centuries Winnipeg has grown by developing new land as do all cities which have available land. Since federal rules have provided the current demand for many thousands of new homes, the only practical answer is new residential greenfield development. We should be worried that Ontario cities have seen big apartment developments stall as developers, who are seeking the pre-sale income from buyers, as the developers cannot sell the new units and the bank won't lend them money if they have not sold enough units. So, buyers are not necessarily going to be there for the regular full-price apartments that we are planning to put up. Anyway, we should be worried of that. Happy to note that. Decisions like this, on what type of units, should largely be made by local real estate professionals, not by an ideal a thousand...idealogue a thousand miles away, even if there is support locally. On timelines: This is one of the items that I spoke...want to speak to. Those making this motion were well intended, but not ambitious enough. Surely, waiting years for a development to be approved is intolerable nowadays. But when less than 10 hours of work is involved and 90-day delay is a bit generous. If we want...if we are to build new homes fast, our target timelines should be much shorter than what is described in this bit...in this item. Onto Wilkes traffic: Like Councillor Duncan, I support building a new intersection lined up with the future locations of the Moray extension. Until this is done, I favour closing all the area connections on the north side of Wilkes. If the Council decides that they are "dangerous", then that is the best answer, the only safe answer. Even at lower speeds these attributes of those intersections will remain dangerous. The homes of a number of my friends and relatives are very near to Elmhurst so I am very familiar with these traffic issues. I have always been patient and have never had problems using these intersections safely. I want to thank Councillor Duncan for his work on this thing. Provincial highways, I would remind you; Provincial Highway Authorities dealt with several of their dangerous intersections along Highways 100 and 101 by closing those connections. The City claims that these intersections are well clear of danger to us. The option of closing all intersections has not...in my opinion, has not been properly evaluated. It removes all the stated dangers at nearly no cost. And obviously once the new intersection, the Moray intersection, is done, things would be back to being convenient and safe for the traffic light. Please have staff evaluate this easy change. I suggest close all those intersections, then work toward the new intersection mentioned by Councillor Duncan. And as Councillor mentioned, some folks already go to Grant instead because that is safe and conventional stop signs and traffic lights and everything can be done conventionally there and avoid the whole problem with Wilkes. And I would ask you to give some thought to that and I look forward to any questions. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David. Seeing no questions...Or there is one. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Yes, thank you again to David Grant for his comments and insights and observations. And there is one I just wanted to get clarification. I think it is a good point. We talk about, we hear statistics on new units, but he did...he did make the question that I admit I have never thought of, the number of units that are destroyed, and to be fair, usable units, which he mentioned. And so, just to get this straight, Mr. Grant, you are talking about we should be getting the information on new net usable...usable units, not the number of new units because that would stop our actual, reasonable statistic, is that right?

David Grant: Yes. We...I watch the TV news as much as I can. And quite often on same the broadcast we hear about progress being made to provide new accommodations for people, and on the same broadcast they show a multi-family place like a hotel, a residential hotel, being burned and destroyed and probably never rebuilt. So, it is obvious that the news coverage, the added...units added and the units deleted, and it just struck me, that would be a more fair way of describing it because anything we can do to prevent units from being deleted from the pool is a worthwhile thing. You know, whether that is smoke detectors or policing that kind of stuff. But let's not have any more of these units destroyed. And I think that is...that would tell the picture more clearly. And thank you very much for the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, David, for your presentation today. Our next delegation...oh, just before that, Councillor Allard, you wish to ask for suspension of the rules?

Councillor Allard: Yes, I would like to suspend the rules to allow for an additional delegation, Tom Scott, regarding EPC Report No. 16 – Amendments to the Real Estate Policy Framework.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. It is the PP and D Report 16? That is right. So, additional delegation, five minutes, no questions at the end. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you. Joining us remotely is Jean Trottier, Chair of the Little Forks National Urban Park Proposal Advisory Committee appearing in opposition to Item 16, report of the Property and Development Committee dated September 13th, regarding amendments to the Real Estate Policy Framework in Support of Affordable Housing. Welcome.

Jean Trottier: [French Spoken 2:06:13 to 15]

Mr. Mayor, Councillors, thank you for giving me the opportunity to speak to the September 13th report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. My name is Jean Trottier and I am a landscape architect and urban

planner and associate professor in the department of Landscape Architecture at the University of Manitoba. I am also the chairperson for the Little Forks Advisory Committee, which for the last two years, as some of you know, have been developing a proposal to create a national urban park in the core area of Winnipeg along the Red, Seine and Assiniboine Rivers. This proposal is currently under review by Parks Canada, the City of Winnipeg and their Indigenous partners. The proposal is supported by several organizations including some that have, you know, submitted their opposition to the current report. And more specifically, to the transfer of 825 Taché Avenue to surplus property. Now, 825 Taché is right at the northern end of Taché Avenue next to Whittier Park, close to Whittier Park in that thin strip of land between Taché and the Red River. The Little Fork Advisory Committee recommends that City Council not declare 825 Taché Avenue as surplus land at this time. 825 Taché Avenue is one of a small group of properties about 200 meters of riverfront in total that currently separates Whittier Park from the Red River recreational trail that runs along Taché Avenue southward to the southward bridge and then across to The Forks. As one of the few gaps in otherwise well-established public river trail system, these properties should instead be retained to help consolidate park land between Taché Avenue and the Red River and to permit future completion of the trail...the river trail system. Much like going to the waterfront, the 20-year downtown Winnipeg waterfront vision approved by City Council in 2024, the Little Forks National Urban Park proposal envisions a continuous trail system along the downtown riverbanks. It identifies 825 Taché and adjacent properties as keystone or strategic properties for the creation of the National Urban Park. It is our understanding that 825 Taché Avenue has been assessed as surplus property in the context of the City's housing policy. But the decision to declare municipal land as surplus should also consider other long-term municipal policies. Though OurWinnipeg 2045 commits to, "protecting and enhancing Winnipeg's forest, green spaces, natural environment and natural area corridors, including Winnipeg's connecting riverbank corridors." Section D.1 established neighbourhoods of the Complete Communities Strategy, which applies here in the case of St. Boniface, states that, "The City should acquire lands where possible to add to the linear parkway network and riverbank areas." Declaring City-owned recurrent properties as surplus land is inconsistent with these policies. It seems also incongruous that recurring land would be disposed of as the City is developing its master plan for our green spaces and natural corridors by-law, its biodiversity policy, its urban forest strategy and its parks and recreation strategies, all of which identify waterways as strategic assets. From the inception of the Winnipeg parks to the 1947 metropolitan parkways plan and the 1993 riverbank parkways system, private riverbank ownership has always been the greatest impediment to public access to waterways. So, it seems counterproductive for the City to dispose of the recurring properties it has acquired over the years rather than using these as assets for achieving its historical, recreational, and environmental goals. Every piece of municipal recurring land declared surplus is a missed opportunity. Once they are gone, they are gone. We recommend to Council that all municipality owned recurring properties be retained in perpetuity for the benefit of current and future generations. This includes 825 Taché Avenue as well as other properties such as 45 Archibald, which has been declared surplus in April of 2024 by...but is also identified as another keystone or strategic property by the Little Forks proposal because of its ecologically strategic location at the mouth of the Seine River. In summary, we would encourage City Council to, first, not approve 825 Taché as surplus property and amend the motion accordingly. Two, instruct the Chief Administrative Officer to remove 45 Archibald and other recurring properties from the surplus properties list. And three, instruct the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development to revise the criteria for declaring City-owned property as surplus by excluding recurring properties. Now, before I take any questions, I want to make clear that we are not opposed to social housing. I have already had to field two questions from reporters today saying that we were opposed to social housing project in St. Boniface. This is not the case. We want to make sure that the social housing development is evolving in consideration of the other long-range policies and priorities and hopefully this Natural Urban Park that might come to fruition in the coming years. And then, maybe in this particular instance here, based on the information that I have, opportunities to be creative and achieve both. We do not know. We do not have the commission at this point. So, our concern is that we might actually sell properties that may prove really strategic in the implementation of our river corridor vision. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any questions for our delegation? Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you to the delegation; is the delegation aware that the St. Boniface North...St. Boniface Secondary Plan does call for the linear parkway to be developed? And that is really my only question.

Madam Speaker: Could I just hold that? We do have another delegation as well, and then we will come back to the questions. Jean, if you could just stay with us. Our next delegation, Pam Lucenkiw, who is also appearing in opposition to this item. Welcome.

Pam Lucenkiw: Good afternoon. I had a couple of reports that I had revised slightly. So, if they are of interest to anyone later, for the wording of this presentation. So, my name is Pam Lucenkiw and I am co-chairs of OURS Winnipeg, a city-wide greenspace advocacy organization. I am here today in opposition to the agenda Item 16, specifically regarding the declaration of City-owned land surplus. To be clear, we are not opposed to affordable housing. To begin, I acknowledge that Winnipeg has made great strides in protecting green space, especially since 2022 with the Master Plan, the

thousand acres of additional green space and the Montreal pledge. Last November at EPC, I told the story about CBC Winnipeg's Up To Speed radio host asking a question; What is your vision for Winnipeg, and anything goes? The listeners response was a natural corridor along the Assiniboine River from The Forks to Assiniboine Park where you never have to stop to cross a road. Well, we know once land is developed it is almost impossible to get it back. We say, it is too bad, there is nothing we can do about that. The City has been unable to acquire parkland by purchasing it. Think Lemay Forest and Sumka. The easiest most economical way for the City to acquire parkland is by converting land that it already owns. The City is missing out on an opportunity by declaring City-owned land along waterways and natural areas as surplus to be used for development. The two properties of concern today are 45 Archibald, which was declared surplus April 2024, and 825 Taché on today's agenda. City Council made a commitment to acquire 1,000 acres of parkland. By adding these two acres...or almost acres, we could make a small dent in the thousand acres. It would be minimal. There may be other properties that we are not aware of that should be added. Acquiring riverside and natural areas to create river corridors requires a steady, long-range, big picture approach. Land must be acquired piece by piece. Opportunities must be taken advantage of as they arise and the City must be ready. A fund must be set aside to support it. 825 Taché and 425 Archibald are two pieces of the missing links of the Red River natural corridor and the National Urban Park plan. These two properties are very different. 825 Taché has long been sought by the neighbourhood to be a link in the existing linear park. It makes sense to acquire this land from a parks planning perspective. Putting a condo there to take up part of the property would be...make as much sense as putting a condo in the middle of Lyndale or Churchill Drive Park, and especially if it is going to be a national urban park. To put a condo in the middle of it would not be a good look. 45 Archibald on the surface looks like an unusual place for parkland. It is definitely a terrible place for housing. On a noisy, isolated, industrial, dusty block of land, it is a place you do not want to live. In another way, it is a gem. It backs onto the Red River corridor across from Point Douglas. Hidden behind the dust and noise is a stretch of forest that wildlife and walkers use. The corridor connects with Whittier Park. 45 Archibald is the poster child of what the United Nation's Decade of Ecosystem Restoration needs. The decade is a reference, also, for the Master Greenspace Plan. Think about Archibald when I say these points from the national...from the Decade of Ecosystem Restoration. This is Archibald. Restoring urban systems requires awareness and commitment from both citizens and decision-makers. Poor planning leaves little space for vegetation. The condition of ecosystems profoundly affects our lives. Urban areas are a radical transformation of natural areas. Urban ecosystems help clean our air and water. Cool urban heat islands support our well-being. They host a surprising amount of biodiversity. Civic authorities can clean up waterways. That is from the Decade of Ecosystem Restoration for Urban Areas. I have more.

Madam Speaker: That concludes the time for your presentation, but we will take questions at this time. First question is by Councillor Allard. You can either pose it to Jean or to Pam or both.

Councillor Allard: Sure, well, to...well, to both, I guess. The question is, St. Boniface residents adopted the St. Boniface...North St. Boniface Secondary Plan, and that does complete the parkway. So, the parkway is part of the City plan. It is are you aware? Unfortunately, I have to ask the question.

Pam Lucenkiw: So, why would it be sure plus now then? Does that contradict the secondary plan, that it is now being declared surplus?

Madam Speaker: Pam, if you want to make your comments, just direct your questions through the Chair. Thank you. Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: So, Madam Chair, through you to the delegates; the secondary plan does govern land development. And urban planners recommend developments in the context of secondary plans. The secondary plan clearly calls for a linear park in north St. Boniface. It came with the support of the North St. Boniface Residents' Association, majority of residents that were polled during the update of the secondary plan in 2017. And the...I guess the hope is that over time we will be able to reclaim that land using the development process in order to complete that linear park. So, that is...that is a bit of background and all of this is subject to public hearings.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions?

Jean Trottier: Madam Speaker, if I could.

Madam Speaker: Yes, Jean, you would like to respond?

Jean Trottier: Respond to this. Yes. Yes, too. The concern, I think, on our part is that all of those plans are supportive...thankfully supporting each other. Secondary plan, the...back to the waterfront plan and then, in our case, the national urban park proposal. Our concern is that it is a lot easier to put in a trail, but also to maintain a substantial riparian buffer to the river that allows the ecosystem a certain degree of integrity when you own the land. Once you sold the land and you try to get some easement back or some land back for the implementation of the trail, it is a much more

difficult process as we have seen in other parts of the city. So, there are many areas where we would rather suggest that the City maintains ownership of the properties that are riparians to ensure that their substantial riparian zone can be created and maintained along with the recreational trails. And then, if there is additional land available, then these would become surplus land. In the case of the property here on Taché, we are...I have to admit, we are not entirely clear with what the information was provided in terms of the extent of the property boundaries. There is, you know, another property between the river and 825 Taché, from my understanding. So, there might be some flexibility there. And the one on Archibald, the property goes all the way up to the river. So, again, the only ways that we might be able to eventually get the trail in there would be if there were some flooding restrictions that might require some setbacks from the part of the developer. But it is a lot easier to do when the City owns the land. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question, Councillor Allard.

Councillor Allard: Yes, I guess in response to that, are you aware, to the delegates, that in land sales, the Public Service can attach conditions and has in the past? Things like developer shall construct the park, stabilize the riverbank, et cetera. Things that might be in line with the North St. Boniface Secondary Plan, for example, and all the other planning documents?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Jean?

Jean Trottier: Yes, we are aware. Many of these have been implemented. In fact, as far as the only place where this has been implemented systematically and is supported by legislation is along the Seine River corridor, within the 100-year flood plain. In other parts, it is hit and miss if you go along the Assiniboine River and you see some of the recent developments, the interaction between river and the back of the development is hit and miss here and there. So, again, it is a question of security is, you know, once you own the land, when you own the land, it is, you know, you ensure that these things will be provided. I know the vision that the City has for these river corridors is actually implemented. Once you get rid of the land, it is a lot more difficult to get those things back.

Pam Lucenkiw: Madam Speaker?

Madam Speaker: Yes, Pam.

Pam Lucenkiw: Yes, I did not really find the secondary plan. Like, I was looking at the material I had. But it is sort of...like, we are looking forward to a very interesting master plan for greenspace. It is going to be probably a showpiece for the City of Winnipeg. And so, are we...and so, there are so many areas that will not be available to the natural corridors plan. Is that...is that...could that be changed? Can that...can secondary plans be revised in light of new planning and new ideas?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any final question? No. I will move on. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, to the...through the Speaker to the delegations here today; are you aware that there is no report attached to the report that is before us today? And that that is in violation of the 1999 real estate audit and the firehall audit that was before this committee, this Council, about a decade ago. That there is not a full analysis of this, that this is a motion on the fly and it is in a violation of two major audits that were conducted by the City of Winnipeg that said full reports...

Madam Speaker: ...Councillor Wyatt, you've asked your question...

Councillor Wyatt:...Include circulation of Members of Council, would be documented. And that we have no documentation tied to this matter and that Council before has had its knuckles rapped over motions on the fly without full detailed reports and it is happening again. Are you aware of that?

Jean Trottier: I can answer to that. I was not aware of this. What we were aware of is that the actual addresses of the properties came in very late. I got them on Monday late at night. And obviously it is very difficult to get a full understanding of what is being disposed of as an asset. Yes, so.

Councillor Wyatt: Further to my question, I want to make it very clear that everybody is in favour of social housing, affordable housing. I think that is what the rush is. too, to do that. But are you also aware that members of Council were circulated as of...as of...late as December of last year. And indeed, I indicated my opposition to number 0 Cal Gardner, because of its key location in terms of park connectivity and trail connectivity in the area, that it should not be disposed of. But of course, that is not captured in this because there is no report. And we are in violation...

Madam Speaker: ...Question, Councillor Wyatt...

Councillor Wyatt: ... are you aware of that?

Madam Speaker: Jean, would you like to respond? Okay.

Councillor Wyatt: Last question...

Madam Speaker: Final question, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the fact that Council is violating its own policies with regards to real estate disposable owned lands based on previous audits before, do you...are you aware that you have legal rights at your disposal as a community in light of this decision by Council to move forward without a report before it today?

Madam Speaker: Would you like to respond?

Jean Trottier: It is noted. I will bring this forward to our group, but I would rather, at this point, work with the City than against the City. And I think that we can all pull together in the same direction. I do not think that in this instance we are, you know, very far in terms of accommodating all the different desires. But, certainly, we have concerns.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I believe that the door was opened in an implicit question that was asked with respect to why the media was, you know, contrasting the support for Little Forks Park with a lack of support, for instance, and I think the Speaker felt, Madam Speaker, that this was unfair and perhaps I do, too, for affordable housing. But then, taken together, Madam Speaker, both speakers...you know, then we heard Madam Lucenkiw, you know, say, this is not a place for condos. So, I want to make sure that I provide a bit of a preamble to provide information and then ask the implicit question, which is, does this change your mind today and does this provide you comfort? So, that is going to be my question, Madam Speaker, but first, I have to provide a bit of information that climate and housing affordability are intertwined. And that climate change continues to compromise the housing and living circumstances of communities, including people who are sleeping rough on our riverbanks.

Madam Speaker: Okay, question, Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: So, this has impacts. But both things are true. While this list, including 45 Archibald; 825, in particular, Taché, will have a significant park dedicated, right, to go to rezoning application, a significant park portion, Madam Speaker. Therefore, fitting into the ambitions that I share of national historic park initiative.

Madam Speaker: The question, please.

Councillor Rollins: As I said before, Madam Speaker, that my question is, does this provide you comfort, does this change your mind? Because I think it is unfair to characterize these as condos when the report is called Affordable Housing, that this Council all supported. And it draws into...I think, should provide these two speakers and advocates comfort that a park will be dedicated and that both things can be true. We can address climate change in housing and provide affordable housing and social housing on City property while also dedicating a large portion to parks that, frankly, would not be there if this report. Does that provide you comfort? Does that change your heart and mind today? Those are the questions.

Madam Speaker: That concludes the question period under this delegation. Okay.

Pam Lucenkiw: Who is...who are you asking?

Madam Speaker: It has timed...the time is timed out on the clock, so we are going to move on to the next delegation now. Thank you. Okay, next we have Chris Scott, President of ATU. Mr. Clerk, just to clarify, it is indeed Chris Scott next? We have another delegation coming forward here in the chamber. Yes, so it is Chris Scott, President of ATU, Local 1505, who is appearing in opposition to Item 1 of the report of the Public Works Committee dated September 12th regarding the North Garage Replacement Project Budget Status. Welcome.

Chris Scott: Thank you, Madam Chair, Mr. Mayor and Members of Council for allowing me to speak. I come forward today because of the recommendation from Public Works to stick to the original quote garnered many years ago prior to the pandemic, the original 200 million dollars for the North Garage Replacement out on Oak Point Highway. This is

contrary to the recommendation from the department that the cost overruns be partially funded. They did not ask to fund the entire 105 million cost overruns, but fund it partially to 80 million, which would allow a lot of the key infrastructure to still be moved. This new garage is slated to be the hub for the zero emission buses. With that there are a lot of safety measures that have to be implemented into building construction, such as proper firewalls to protect the rest of the fleet or occupants from thermal runaway. Early detection systems such as thermal cameras and alarms are essential equipment critical to the development of this. And we have the concern that dropping it back to the original funding amount will jeopardize this. The Premier himself...himself said he wants Winnipeg and the province to be the new leader in public transit both in investment and innovation, which is the zero-emission technologies. Yes, there is a budgetary crunch. The costs of zero emission buses are far more, generally twice the cost of diesel buses, but this is the way the industry is going. Not having mechanical capacity, not installing hoists in this garage is going to severely impact the ongoing maintenance of the fleet. Zero emission buses require more regular maintenance, more inspections and the eliminations of hoists from this plan puts the service at risk. The full amount of the new garage, we feel should be fully funded, but would have accepted the recommendation of the department to fund the 80 million of the cost overruns. There is also the requirement, obviously, on my part, as well as those involved to lobby the other partners in this project to up their funding to cover those cost overruns. It is not all on one level of government. A true partnership is equal shares for a project. So, I will be speaking with members of the provincial government tomorrow and with the federal government after that to plead as well to properly invest in the transit system. With that, this garage should be viewed as an investment and not an expense. It is an essential for long-term health of the transit system. It is the backbone of a public transit network, an active transportation network. We are investing in all the bike paths. We need to invest in public transit which will take the ease off the infrastructure if we can get more people to use transit because it becomes more reliable. This also works in partnership with the Transit Master Plan implementation later next year. We need to ensure that we have all the facilities and equipment necessary to have that plan implemented successfully. I have been working with the department to adapt processes and measures to staff up to make sure we have enough operators and maintenance personnel to ensure this plan is implemented appropriately. We need to keep pace with the rest of the country. Yes, transit systems across the country are being underfunded by their provincial and federal counterparts, but we all need to step up and fund this because investment in transit is good for the economy, it is good for the community. Years ago, when my predecessor John Callahan stood here, he marked that every dollar invested in transit nets a three-dollar economic spin-off. That number is generally accepted to be a five-dollar economic spin-off, with some reports saying a seven-dollar economic spin-off. So, there is the reclaiming of this investment in time. Will you have it right away? No, you will get it in time. So, for those reasons, I would ask that the Council send this back, have it reassessed and move to fund beyond the original 200-million-dollar project costs from 2019.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We have another delegation on this item as well, so I will ask you to stand down, Chris. And we will call you back for questions. I would like to call forward Steve Snyder who is also opposed to this item. And there will be five minutes on the clock. Welcome, Steve.

Steve Snyder: Thank you. Out of an abundance of respect for your time and this process, I will be very brief. I am coming to you today as a citizen, but not just a citizen, a member of a wide variety of organizations working in mode shift, community economic development, municipal finance, and environmental sustainability. While I won't say I represent all of the different groups that I am involved with, I am merely using that as the context for my presentation. Since we are...we have already heard from the Public Service regarding the operational risks and from the union regarding the operational risks involved. My report won't go into the operational side of things. But what I would like to share is my personal perspective as one of the members of...who have come forward, spent countless hours reading documents, informing themselves and preparing in the public engagement process with the City of Winnipeg and Council. Three years of time have been invested in the consultation for the Transit Master Plan. And this plan feeds into other policies such as the City's Strategic Priority Action Plan, Action No. 4.4, the Climate Action Plan's Mode Shift Goals, OurWinnipeg 2045 and the current ongoing consultation for Winnipeg's Transportation Master Plan. This report here first appeared at SPC Public Works agenda on 8th of September and was approved by EPC on the 17th of September. That is merely nine days. Council have put these plans...have put all of the policy plans in jeopardy in the span of nine days. The countless hours of all of these groups, not to mention the Public Service's hours, and all the citizens that took time...of their personal time to listen, learn, inform and collaborate. All of that time wasted. The staff hours wasted. Engagement wasted. If this goes forward, all of that time will be wasted because this puts in jeopardy, it is the high-risk option and it puts in jeopardy those policy plans. So, not even mentioning that a properly functioning opera...an operational transit system is a requirement for a 21st century of our size. This report is being approved at the speed of the Canadian 4x100 team. It is the blink of an eye compared to the amount of time that has been put into these policy plans. And it is a slap in the face to everyone who was involved in the engagement process; internal and external. The Engage Winnipeg Policy says that public engagement...the public engagement process is there to improve relationships between the City, the public, and stakeholders by building trust to ensure public engagement is meaningful. Why hold these at all when you are destroying the trust in a matter of days? That is it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now take questions. Councillor Eadie. If I could ask you to come forward to the podium, please. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. I am just rising to kind of help the delegation understand why we are kind of at this situation. So, Madam Speaker, prior to our former Mayor leaving, deciding not to run, Madam Speaker, what had happened was, there was applications for some major provincial, federal dollars in order to move forward some really important and needed projects, including the North Winnipeg Garage as well as phase two of the bios...the phase two biosolids effort over in the North Winnipeg Sewage Plant. And Madam Speaker, those went forward without a class three estimate as to what the costs might be. And Madam Speaker, I do not know if they are aware, but ultimately, I heard somebody say cost overruns, but really, what it is is it is we did not move forward with a proper class estimate before requesting federal dollars. So, I do not know that I would call it a cost overrun, I call it a poor planning, poor effort. I do not know if they would agree, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Eadie. The response.

Chris Scott: Yes, I did read in the report that the request to go to the class three cost analysis to get a more accurate picture, and I believe this would be prudent as well. Unfortunately, as Councillor Eadie stated, it should have been done before asking for money. But I am sure that whoever is on staff that is involved with negotiations for inter-governmental affairs is quite proficient in getting money from the other levels of government. If they are half as proficient as the Labour Relations Department, then they are excellent negotiators and along with the union and other parties involved pushing them, I do not see why we cannot get the money.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Mayes, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Mayes: What can I say? I hate to say I told you so, but I did warn people. When you use wildly different evaluations for different plans, this is what happens. You have the sewer plan with a billion-dollar price tag, but then you build in billion-dollar contingency and suddenly it is a two-billion-dollar thing. Transit, 800-million-dollar plan, we put in a 300 million dollar, because that is what the consultant was comfortable with. So, suddenly, you have these wildly different billion-dollar discrepancies and different plans. Of course you are drawn to the Transit one because it is so much cheaper, but only because of the assumptions. The assumption, you are sort of saying it is being done at speed of the Canadian relay team. You would agree in the budget it says it is a class five and we won't go ahead necessarily until we get a class three cost estimate. Councillor Lukes has been right on this, it was never guaranteed to go ahead. It was put in as a class five estimate. Everybody knew that from the start that we would be waiting to see what the final price tag is. The tradition here, of course, is to low ball everything and then you get your project in at a wildly higher rate when the moment comes. But the relay analogy does not hold up too well because everybody's known it is a class five estimate right from the start, right from when it first went into the budget.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response.

Steve Snyder: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. I am just merely speaking as a citizen and what I perceive as the outcome of this. I see not funding this transit garage properly a high risk because that is what the Public Service has told us. I see that if we do not go ahead with this we put our policy plans at risk. Policy plans that have taken a very long time to put together to approve, that have come to Council and been approved by you sitting here. That is all I can speak to regarding this and my own perception, so I will apologize if that does not answer your question.

Councillor Mayes: I guess, would not we all agree there is a risk if you do not adequately fund sewage treatments that you will be done at 2095 instead of the provincial deadline of 2047? And given that we have allocated 18 million dollars toward the billion-dollar phase three of North End Sewage Treatment Plant, which after all, is supposed to help clean up nutrient levels in Lake Winnipeg which we were tasked to do in 2003. I mean, that has its risks as well, I suppose. And it is not...the problem is, we are debating these things using completely different numbers from our staff. So, I appreciate there is a risk to the Transit Master Plan, but I also appreciate the plan to move forward on sewage treatment lies in tatters if we do not actually get some accurate debating going on this. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. The response?

Chris Scott: I understand the difficulty in choosing priority over major infrastructure plans. And definitely, we would not want to destroy the environment with having the sewage treatment plan fail. With that being said, we need to change, in some aspects, our thought processes to the degree of major developments. Not speaking exclusively to the one that was discussed today with regards to Portage Place. But in many of these major developments, deals such as tax breaks are provided to spur development. Why do we just give away that money or not collect it? Why not do tax deferrals? We will give you 10 years of this reduction, but in the next 10 years, you must pay it. Get yourself off your feet and then we

will claim the money. We may not have it right now, but we will get it. Some Councillors that sit on the committee may be aware of the...this is the end of the line leading mobility consulting report where it speaks to...we have to become creative on other revenue sources for funding transit models because the traditional funding models are falling short. They recommend stuff such as vehicle levees, vehicle for hire taxes or fees, off-street parking fees. These are things that would help fund the public transportation system and would help with congestion as well.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Steve Snyder: May I add to that? My apologies. I do understand that the Chief Planner for Transit or one of the planners for Transit actually mentioned all of those at Public Works and recommended a couple of them to actually help fund something like this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Lukes.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. And thank you to Chris Scott and for Steve Snyder for sharing their concerns on a really important issue. When it comes to transit, when it comes to buses, to me, the biggest issue is buses. The lifeblood of our transit system is buses. No ambiguity, when it is 30 below you want to get on a bus and it does not matter whether it is three minutes faster or three minutes slower, you want to get on that bus and ideally, when you have a transfer when it is 30 below, you have a safe, warm place to transfer.

Madam Speaker: Question, please.

Councillor Schreyer: What are our primary concerns when it comes...if we...if this garage ends up being under-funded to the satisfaction of our initial plans, what are your greatest concerns about what is going to happen to the vitality of our transit system, our dependability?

Chris Scott: Well, as stated in part of my presentation, with the reduction of hoists that were due, I believe it was 16 hoists, roughly, that were slated to go into this garage, that would impact the service going out. If we do not have the hoist to do the inspections, maintenance or repairs to the buses, that will keep them off the road longer. We do...we do have an out of service that is quite high at the moment. They are working diligently to bring that back under control. Unfortunately, it is also due to staffing issues on the trades. We also have the concern that building the scaled-back version of the garage will result into the fact that I will not see these new phases in my lifetime. We will not get there because as we know, costs never go down. I saw a short time ago a plan for a subway, not Mayor Juba's LRT, but a subway that ran from Disraeli to roughly where Polo Park is now. And that was decided not to go because 11 million dollars was too expensive. It is not 11 million dollars anymore. The longer we delay this, the more expensive it will get and we will be paying more in the long run. It is short-term pain for long-term gain, we feel.

Councillor Schreyer: Extension?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question and Councillor Schreyer moves extension of two minutes. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Schreyer: Sure. So, for all the billions of dollars we put into our transit system, holding back on this project could actually hold back on the number of buses we have on the road servicing people when it is minus 30?

Chris Scott: That is a real possibility, yes it is, as a result of the ability to properly maintain and repair them with the lack of the hoists.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next question, Councillor Lukes, followed by Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Lukes: It is...the time is up.

Madam Speaker: Okay, that concludes our time under this delegation. Thank you for your presentation. I guess that timed out as well. Did you just start the clock, Josh? Okay, the clock was just started, so Councillor Lukes, go ahead. We did not hear the buzzer.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, alright. Okay. So, how to...how to say this, like, I have got to...I am really going to elaborate this when I speak to the motion, but did you know, and you do, you mentioned...

Steve Snyder: I think 'did you know' is copywritten.

Councillor Lukes: Yes. You were aware of the report, the Leading Mobility consulting report that came out, This Is The End Of The Line? You are aware of that?

Chris Scott: Yes, I am.

Councillor Lukes: Right. And I guess...I guess the fact of the matter is, like, that report was really...it really resonated. The fact of the matter is, we really cannot afford electrification. We cannot afford to transition to zero emission buses with the funding that we have and with the fees. Did you know that?

Chris Scott: Yes, I am aware of that. The cost of the electric bus are approximately double of a diesel bus and the hydrogen fuel cell is higher than electric bus.

Councillor Lukes: Right. So, and did you know, we have all these other priorities like the sewer treatment plant, like the closed Arlington Bridge, which none of them have money for? None of them have money for.

Chris Scott: Yes, I am aware.

Councillor Lukes: Okay. And did you know that we asked the Department to...

Madam Speaker: ...Councillor Lukes, that is your third question.

Councillor Lukes: That is it? This is it?

Madam Speaker: Well, the one you are presenting.

Councillor Lukes: Did you know that we asked Transit to come back in January and tell us how they could look at possibly doing something with 200 million that would put maintenance in? Maybe we leverage the North Garage...or the old North Garage for a while. Did you know that we asked Transit to come back with...

Chris Scott: I was aware by a chance discussion...

Madam Speaker: ...Councillor Wyatt moves extension. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Chris Scott: I was aware in a chance discussion with the Director that a report was asked to come back in January, but I was not aware of the content of what that report would be.

Councillor Lukes: And we can talk more offline about that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty, followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much to both the gentlemen for being here. My question, I guess, is more directed to Mr. Scott. You have more knowledge on that of how the transit system operates. If we were to continue using the North Garage for a period of time mostly for storage of buses, how would you see the new Route 90 facility built? Would it be more the servicing side; the hoists and the mechanical side or more bus storage or more electrification of buses? Do you have...I mean, I think we have asked our department to do that, but do you have any opinions on your side?

Chris Scott: Well, the new Oak Point Garage is slated to be zero emission bus guided or geared. North Garage is essentially on its last legs. Some new windows and siding would be good, but it is not going to hold it up. North Garage also only has two hoists. They do very minor maintenance; oil changes and inspections. But the...we would need to see the new garage built in a way that addresses...even if zero emission buses are delayed, that it addresses that they are coming and we will be ready for them when they are here. And part of that is hoists. I have seen the two versions of plans. As an architectural student through high school, I am aware it is far cheaper to change something on paper than it is in real life. And I am impressed by the modified plans from the first draft to the second draft. And I am sure they are capable, with some improvement in this funding, of providing what is needed with the upcoming zero emission buses at a reduced 305 million dollars, as it is mentioned in the...in the report, to meet the needs of the service and the buses added to the fleet.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Browaty: Will you let us know as soon as possible if you have any success in talking to the partners at the provincial and the federal level to provide us with additional funding?

Chris Scott: I will let anybody know that wants to know, I have a labour liaison meeting with all labour leaders and the provincial caucus tomorrow morning. And I will be talking with the necessary MLAs on this issue.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you. Are you aware that we passed the Transit Master Plan only a few months ago, actually, right before the summer, and that with the decision made on the transit garage, we are now violating our own policy that we just passed?

Chris Scott: I am aware that the Master Plan was passed in June, but I am not aware that this decision would violate any policy.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, it does because we cannot meet the policy...

Madam Speaker: ...That concludes our question period under this delegation. Thank you for your time. Our last delegation is Tom Scott appearing in opposition on the Item 16, Property and Development Committee. It is regarding the Real Estate Policy Framework. It will be five minutes, no questions. Welcome.

Tom Scott: First off, I want to make it very clear that I am not opposed to the actual motion that you have going forward on the affordable housing. I am just opposed to the fact that you are putting up the surplus land at 825 Taché for any other reason other than park. I have lived in for St. Boniface for over 30 years and I have seen...and if you can visualize just driving down Taché, you drive past the hospital, you see the riverbank, the new Belvedere that is being put out there. You know, the way they fixed up the riverbank. You go down, you cross Provencher, the old tourist hotel is gone – beautiful park space from Taché right to the river. That whole area used to be junkyards and everything else. Now what do we have? We have beautiful park space from Taché right to the river. And what do we have on the other side of the street? We have condos. Nice condos that add density to the area, bring in the tax dollars. We love it. It is a great mix of what we need in the area: density and park space in the linear park area. Now you get to the overpass and all of a sudden you can visualize, very easily visualize, the difference in the vision of past Mayors and Council and the current and previous one where they decided that no, we are not going to have this beautiful riverbank park from Taché to the river, we are going to have a little bit of parkway in the back and residential in the front. Now, if we put residential on that land, land on the opposite side of Taché, I doubt very highly will be high-priced condos bringing in needed tax dollars. Affordable housing, we are willing to have anywhere in St. Boniface. We have multitude of social housing in the area and it adds and it contributes to the character of the neighbourhood. We are not opposed to any type of housing whatsoever, just housing in the right spots and does not affect the livability and the quality of life for the people. I forget when it was, but over 40 years ago, the Old St. Boniface Residents' Association, which I am here today representing as president, took all the way to the Supreme Court a development on Messenger. Instead of having high-rise there, we now have a nice park area with million-dollar homes fronting this. We would not have had those million-dollar homes there. We would have had condos and the rest of the area would have been just devastated. Think of what you are going to do by destroying the riverbank to other areas of the community that can be developed properly. The community expected...and because of all of that development, all the junkyards, the tourist hotel, all those other places taken down, the community always expected that the old St. Boniface Public Work yards, which were taken over when...amalgamated with the City of Winnipeg, would become park space. Other than two residential lots that are there. And we informed Council and anybody who would listen to us, and it was agreed that those two lots would remain residential because we did not feel that those residential property owners that were not allowed by the City of Winnipeg to develop their properties, maintain them and improve them and that, should not lose their rights. We did not ever expect that the City of Winnipeg would take those rights of those two over to the City of Winnipeg itself so that they could develop the old Public Works yard. We want to see this City Council do what the past City Councils have done and had the vision of that linear parkway all the way down. If this goes into development, the other two pieces of property along the river there on Taché that are not developed are too small to see a development in front with park space behind. So, we would have this one building there and for what? The City assessed the land at 600,000 dollars. I do not know what you would get for it, but you could not buy that type of parkland for \$600,000. You know, we always hear about, you know, somebody just mentioned about prices going up. 11 million for a subway before. How much would it cost to buy that 10, 15 years from now? And with the Urban Park in that...oh, I have got five minutes. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Tom, thank you for your presentation today.

Tom Scott: Thank you for everything, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now move in to reports of the Executive Policy Committee. Mr. Mayor, the report dated September 17th. There will be some items that will be stood down as a result of amending motions.

**REPORT OF THE
EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
DATED SEPTEMBER 17, 2024**

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, Madam Speaker, I would introduce the agenda and move Items 1 through 20, but I would like to pull Item No. 3. I believe there is a motion on Item 9, as well, for sure.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. And Item 2, also. There is an amending motion for that. Okay, Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: 3, 7, 9 and 19.

Madam Speaker: Okay. 7 is the monument at Assiniboine Park. And the other number was?

Councillor Wyatt: 3

Madam Speaker: That has been pulled.

Councillor Wyatt: 9.

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: 19.

Madam Speaker: 19 is the Delegated Authority for Occasional Liquor Permits. Any others? ?? 7 has been pulled. I will call the question on 1, 4 through 6, 8, 10 through 14, 15 through 18 and 20. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Councillor Duncan: (Inaudible) 10.

Madam Speaker: That has been noted. Thank you, Councillor Duncan. Madam Clerk.

Item 2 – Boards and Commissions – City Representatives

Madam Speaker: Okay. This item has an amending motion. It is Motion 1. So, we will hear from Mayor Gillingham, followed by Councillor Browaty, who is the mover of the amending motion, which is also seconded by Councillor Lukes. Mr. Mayor...

Mayor Gillingham: ...Yes, thanks. I will just turn it over to Councillor Browaty to introduce his amendment.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Browaty.

Motion No. 1
Moved by Councillor Browaty,
Seconded by Councillor Lukes,

BE IT RESOLVED that Item 2 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 2.C and replace with the following:*

“C. Jessica Hanson, Human Resources Manager, Community Services Department”

Councillor Browaty: Any questions or comments, I will certainly take them.

Madam Speaker: Any other speakers? Do you wish to close, Councillor Browaty? No? Mr. Mayor, I will call the question. Councillor Wyatt?

Councillor Wyatt: This is No. 3?

Madam Speaker: No. 2.

Councillor Wyatt: Oh, No. 2. Yes, no this...alright, no, I want to speak to No. 2.

Madam Speaker: Okay, you have got the floor.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I just want to say that it seems to be where we are using the same policy or the same procedures when it comes to these appointments, boards and procedures. And I always thought that we were going to have a more open process with regards to how folks are being appointed to the various committees. But it has not amounted to that. I would hope that in the future that there would be more of a...especially when it comes to some of these committees that we appoint, it would be a more inclusive process. Often, this seems to stop at the IEPC table for discussion and does not go further. And it is something that I just want to point out that it seems business as usual in terms of these appointments. I am sure they were all...they are...I know they are all very good and appropriate appointments. I am not going to vote against the clause, I am just pointing out the fact that the appointments that, once again, are happening here on a significant committees are happening in the same old fashion way when it has been promised in the past that we would look at things differently and how we do appointments to various boards and commissions. And this is going to be a precursor to the major appointments that are made typically in December or January at the standing...to different various committees and commissions of Council and boards. Hope that the process could be more inclusive, but it never has been, it seems, no matter who gets elected Mayor. And so, my hope is that that could change and open up this process a little more. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Now I will call the question. Councillor Browaty, do you wish to close?

Councillor Browaty: Just to comment on, I guess, sort of what was said there. There are in various collective agreements and different boards and committees and such where it has to be a specific person. In some cases it is, you know, designated as the CFO, with CFO changing, Council has to appoint the new CFO to these positions. A lot of it is formality, but to the point, if there is anything that could be more open, certainly open to looking at that. Thank Councillor Wyatt for the comments.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. I will call the question. We will vote on the amending motion first. All in favour of Motion 1? Contrary? That is carried. And the main item, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Madam Clerk, Item 2...Item 3.

Item 3 – Shareholder Approval for a Sale of the Portage Place Mall Assets, Assignment of Related Skywalk Agreements and Financial Support for a Redevelopment of the Mall

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I think most of us, if not all of us around Council have been looking forward to this report coming forward and us having the opportunity to vote on this and support this significant transformation investment for downtown. We have before us a plan to redevelop the Portage Place Mall site. We know that this site has been underperforming, to say the least, for several years. And what we have here is an initiative, a local investor working with the Provincial and Federal Governments, as well, looking to really transform this space. I want to kind of commend my colleagues for over the last several months and years we have been calling upon True North to make sure that they are doing consultation and, you know, giving them opportunity to do the due diligence. I believe they have done that at this time. There has been robust public consultation. What we have before us now is really an investment that will equal 650 million dollars over the next several years. Our 40 million dollars will be leveraged...in incentives, the value of the incentives is 40 million dollars we are looking at today. It will be leveraged to draw into that site another 600 plus million dollars of investment from other funders. So, to me, this is a very, very good news story. And this is about downtown. It is about attracting local investments. It is one large investment of many other investments that are being made right now into the downtown. I do not think we can underestimate the impact and the positive impact of the commitment between True North and Southern Chiefs Organization. That partnership, establishing a non-profit to ensure that housing is built and affordable housing is included in their development, and those funds kind of...kind of are going back into that housing is really, really key. And it is a partnership that...on a scale that I do not think that we have seen before between a private sector investor and a First Nations community. I do not think we have seen it before on this scale in Manitoba or Winnipeg at least any time recently. It is very, very significant in the heart of our downtown. It really is about economic reconciliation. It is about restoring and reestablishing economic activity within the downtown. It is about housing, it is about health care, it is about community spaces. It is about encouraging others to develop and invest in Winnipeg's downtown, as well. So, I am very glad to have the opportunity to support this today. I will be supporting this without reservation and encourage everyone else to do the same.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise. I am in support of this effort that is being proposed by, well, this group. Given that the Southern Chiefs Organization is involved, Madam Speaker. And I just wanted to say, at this point, I

referred to it earlier but in around 1998/99, Portage Place was already starting to show that there were some struggles. And the business leaseholder, operator, whatever, was having some problems. And it was a 50-year deal that it was originally sealed for Portage Place, Madam Speaker. And there was discussion that the shareholders would end up with this Portage Place back after 50 years, Madam Speaker. And for me, Madam Speaker, back when I was debating this issue, business admin, back in the late '80s, there was a big concern. And I was dismissed by the current, at that time, in the late '90s, the person who was looking after The Forks North Portage, Madam Speaker. And essentially, I was told, well, what do I care about the future? That is a long way down the road, Mr. Eadie, do not worry about it. And I am saying, well, I am worried about it because I think it is going to be a problem even before I pass away. So, it is not something we are passing onto our kids, Madam Speaker. Next generation. So, what we are at today, we are at approximately 35, 36 years into what was the original Portage Place concept and vision and then what became reality and moved forward, Madam Speaker. And you know, it has been a number of years now that we have heard how difficult it is, Portage Place, and that it needed something different. This proposal that we are...sale that we are voting for and what is going to be put on the agenda, Madam Speaker, is much better because the other thing was a total private...well, you could say a not-for-profit is private. But I always had the vision that it should be like a not-for-profit effort for the residential. Business is business, if they want to make money off each other, then, you know, whatever. That is a good thing. That is business, Madam Speaker. So, this one is better in that we have this. And yes, the city...the shareholders are going to receive the sale price. And I believe The Forks North Portage, the organization that we are shareholders of, have intentions on what they want to use that...I cannot remember the exact sale price, but the millions of dollars that will be going into those bank accounts. And I think that is good because that corporation that we are shareholders of, it is not going away. They still run The Forks area. And so, I think that is good. Now, looking at our 40-million-dollar investment, people say, well, you know, what are we giving 40 million dollars to True North? But what we are really doing is, we are investing in some public space, Madam Speaker. And I always hated the idea, I could not move, you know, I used to go to the Autumn Stone record store on Edmonton. And you could get there from Portage Avenue after you got off the bus. You could just walk over there, whatever. And then all of a sudden, there is this big barrier, Madam Speaker. Anyway, I did not like that. Not a good...not a good thing. Anyway, we are open. This plan opens it up at Edmonton for at least pedestrians and an open space. We have the Province is investing in a needed health clinic and whatever else they are having in there, Madam Speaker. I think that is really important. True North is buying and...but will be investing in their for-profit operations. I think that is really important as well. And then, we have the not-for-profit. Now, I believe part of that 40 million is actually a tax incremental financing for some affordable housing in the not-for-profit tower. Now, I only have one concern. It is not a big concern, but when the Province gives subsidy to a not-for-profit like the Winnipeg Housing Rehab Corporation, we are to provide audits of the operations, what is our net loss, what is our net whatever, and then, you know, we present that. I am not sure, Madam Speaker, for accountability purposes, that we get that when we give incremental financing over, I think this one was it 25 or 30 years, Madam Speaker? But I think that we, for public accountability, I trust this effort here, and the purchasers and the board that is going to be running everything. But ultimately, I am not sure if that is going to be there but the contractual stuff, we as Council are not getting into the nitty gritty, the meat of it. We are here to vote on is this a good agreement. We have enough detail on it to know that it is a good project, Madam Speaker. But I think that our Public Service or somebody should see just, you know, for the not-for-profit tower where that funding is going. And the other millions are going in to those public spaces that all of...all of Winnipeggers will be using, hopefully. Hopefully, this is something that will be created and as we move into the future it is a place where people feel comfortable to go, Madam Speaker, from the suburbs or anywhere. I know I cannot wait for it. It will be really exciting. Although, Autumn Stone Records is no longer on Edmonton near Ellice, but. But anyway, so Madam Speaker, I just wanted to rise and speak to it and just mention the one thing just about a little bit of accountability. Does not have to be to Council, but it is some accountability to some manager within the City of Winnipeg just so we can see how things are operating. Because, you know sometimes, and I have seen a lot of this happen, you are going to build a brand new tower or whatever. Over time, like the Winnipeg Housing Rehab, over time, you have the German Society at Mountain and McGregor, it needs some mega repairs and stuff. And it needs ongoing maintenance. And you need to make sure that you are doing that ongoing maintenance so that the building is going to last 100 years, Madam Speaker. Because at some point, some systems have to be replaced and you have to have money in the coffers to be able to do it. Rather than coming to us as government, you are going to be making money on the tower, Madam Speaker, rather than coming to us at government and saying, we do not have enough money to do the repairs. So, let's make sure that that is operating properly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Gilroy, followed by Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is about downtown transformation. And I am very, very excited to be the City Councillor for this area and I share that with Councillor Rollins and, actually, Councillor Santos because everybody in that community really uses this shopping mall as a place to gather. So, I am very happy to support this initiative moving forward. We know that 72 percent, according to some of the data from the BIZ, 72 percent of the people worried about our downtown. We are now showing that we are moving on issues around their downtown and making major investments to get people to live downtown. Because we all know that when people do not go home at 6:00, when

they are living downtown, we are going to have much more vibrant community and we are not going to see some of the safety issues and stuff that people see because we are going to have way more people around walking in and around their downtown. It is very much a community place which I feel, you know, the agreement that is going forward is really not looking at displacing the community, they are looking at bringing them in. And really looking at a space that is needed with a healthcare facility, adding a grocery store. It is really adding to what the community is really needing downtown. And, of course, adding the vibrancy. I really love the aspect of opening Edmonton up and making sure that, you know, there is that north and south connection that I think we have lacked for many, many years. This is really going to do a lot for transforming our downtown. This was a major mall that I think everyone had hopes of, but for many years, it has been depleting and the owner wanting out. And the thought of the doors closing on that mall and it being an empty space would be very traumatic for the community. And now, we have Winnipeggers wanting to reinvest in this space that really understand our downtown and really is the fabric of our community already. So, I am very honoured to help support this. I look forward to the project. It looks very, very exciting. And hope that my Councillor colleagues come along with me. This is in my ward. It really greatly impacts my community this development and very happy to support it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...

Councillor Chambers: Was after Councillor...

Madam Speaker: ...Yes, he was on the list, but he had to leave the chamber for a moment. Yes, thank you.

Councillor Wyatt: I do not mind letting Councillor Chambers speak first.

Madam Speaker: If you would like to, sure. There is a speaking order and it...he had stepped out and I had moved him down. Go ahead, Councillor Chambers. Lots of time for everyone...

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This...like, this is ridiculous already. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: He had stood the item down. So, anyways. Let's move forward.

Councillor Chambers: I am encouraged to see the collaboration between the Southern Chiefs Organization and True North Real Estate Corporation that will see the revitalization of Portage Avenue and to downtown. Moreover, the movements towards actionable reconciliation is clearly demonstrated in this partnership. The anticipated investments of Portage Place hold significance...significant importance for the Southern Chiefs Organization and to True North Real Estate Corporation as it marks strategic collaboration that aims to bring a transformative revitalization to Portage Avenue and to downtown Winnipeg. Portage Place in its day was a prominent shopping mall in the heart of the city. It has faced many challenges in recent years and this joint venture presents opportunity to breathe new life into this space. The SEO representing the interests of Southern First Nations recognizes the economic and social impact that a thriving downtown can have on the community it serves. By partnering with True North Real Estate Corporation, known for its commitment to community development, there is a shared vision to not only rejuvenate the physical space of Portage Place, but also promote a vibrant and inclusive environment that benefits both residents and businesses. This collaboration goes beyond a mere real estate transaction. Reflects a commitment to community building and economic empowerment. The revitalization project is expected to create job opportunities, attract new businesses and provide a platform for Indigenous entrepreneurs to contribute to the economic landscape of Winnipeg. By strategically reimagining Portage Place, the partners aim to enhance the overall experience for residents and visitors alike, turning it into a dynamic hub that reflects the cultural diversity and heritage of the region. The success of this endeavor could serve as a model for other urban renewal projects. Demonstrating positive outcomes that can arise from collaborative efforts between Indigenous organization and private industries. In addition to economic benefits, the revitalization of Portage Place has the potential to redefine city's social and cultural identity. The project aims to create a welcoming space that celebrates the rich history and traditions of Indigenous peoples in the regions. By incorporating elements of Indigenous art, culture and design, the partners hope to cultivate a sense of pride and connection among the local community. And that is exactly what Councillor Gilroy had spoken to earlier. The transformation of Portage Avenue and downtown Winnipeg is not just about bricks and mortar, it is about creating a lasting legacy that honours the past while embracing more vibrant and sustainable futures for all residents. And I believe that is the message of OurWinnipeg 150 this year; our shared stories and our shared future. For that reason, Madam Speaker, I am support of the motion to provide Council support to True North...True North Corporation and ask my Council colleagues to consider supporting this as well so that the renaissance of our downtown can commence in accordance to our own strategic plan of Council in prioritizing our downtown. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. On to you, Councillor Wyatt, you stood the item down and then Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise to support the clause. I will say this, that this is a major subsidy to the industry and to the investors in downtown Winnipeg. Our expectations are very high. I think the Mayor has emphasized that as well, that we will see these major subsidies result in the deliverable housing as well as grocery store and the improvements both to Portage Place, which I am excited to see, and I think we all are, as well as to the former Hudson Bay Building. And it was good to see Chief Daniels here and Mr. Ludlow on behalf of True North. And I would say that the public is expecting...has high expectations. I have heard from many members of the public saying, well, when are we going to see some activity happening? It should be noted that Portage Place was a major investment at the time. It was part of the core area initiative program which was seen at the time as a major magic wand to start dealing with the deterioration and the decline of the downtown. In many ways, it did the opposite. You created it almost like a Berlin Wall effect along Portage Avenue cutting off the north Portage area from the south. It is going to open up that area now with the Edmonton Street opening up again and the ability to create a more walkable and connected community in the downtown. But it should be pointed out that the challenges facing the downtown, Madam Speaker, are not just housing and social housing, the need of it. It is not just the fact that we have invested major dollars through our SHED district and the entertainment tax...the entertainment value of the SHED through the tax increment financing, both provincial and federal subsidies. We should also note...be pointed out that, even with the amenities that are being proposed, that this will not be the silver bullet for the downtown. In many ways, the challenge facing the downtown is one of complete inclusiveness with regards to safety. Right now, if you talk to people who come downtown and I have talked to many, that their concern about the downtown is whether or not they are safe or not or feel safe or perceive to be safe. And that still is the outstanding issue. And whether you build affordable housing or not, yes, that adds more eyes and ears to the sidewalk, grocery store does the same thing, all those improvements will add. But at the end of the day, if people do not feel safe, they won't come. And indeed, the very people who will be living in this affordable housing have a right to live in a neighbourhood where they can step outside their door and feel safe. Right now, that cannot be said for much of the downtown. Just walk outside of this building and you do not have to go far, especially in the evening where you may not feel safe. I have heard it from resident who come down here in public hearings. So, the challenge we are faced with is the how do we deal with it. How do we deal with the urban health crisis that is taking place in the streets of our city as we speak, ongoing? We are not the only city, Madam Speaker, I recognize that, in Canada. But we are not rolling up our sleeves to deal with this. The Mayor's office hired somebody to deal with mental health addiction as well as housing, we have not seen the outcome of that yet. We need to see public policy that would take forward a municipal initiative to deal with the ongoing urban health crisis, both in terms of mental health addiction and housing. The fact that people are still living in shelters in our downtown. The fact that people do not feel safe walking down the sidewalk in our downtown because of the ongoing crisis happening in the streets. The fact that we have, as a city, been funding the police service, but then in the same budget, cutting it by nine million dollars through a so-called efficiency requirement of the Winnipeg Police Service. As long as we keep doing these things; undermining the Winnipeg Police Service, cutting investments, undermining the downtown, we are literally putting one dollar in and two dollars out. We are undermining our efforts. And what is happening now in the city? People are voting. They are voting with their feet. They are slowly leaving the city because they do not feel safe. As a matter of fact, there is neighbourhoods in this city where you would not want to have...raise your family, but there is families living there and they do not feel safe. And the trickle is happening now where they are leaving the city in a trickle. And it has been the pattern in other cities. It could turn into a flood. And so, we sit on the teetering top of a fence. We can go one way or the other at this point in our city. We could either go the way of turning it around and making this a city safe and secure and we invest in it and we start making the investments and have the courage to do so, and that means in terms of taxes and our budget. Or we can watch what is happened in other North American cities that hollow out and it happens quick before you know it. And then you try to turn that around. Good luck. Cities in the United States, some cities in Canada, struggling with that. We cannot let that happen here. But we are literally sitting on top of the fence teetering one way or the other. We have to start to address these issues, Madam Speaker. As long as...this is fantastic. This is great. But as long as we continue to have the crisis that is happening out there, the feeling the city is unsafe, to open our newspapers on Monday morning and see the headline, 'Violent crime up across city for the last year again'. The most violent city...one of the most violent cities in Canada. That is not the headlines we should be reading. We should be reading how it is turning around, how we are achieving the opposite. We are not at this point. Until we are, we have a lot of work to do. And I realize that the challenge I am throwing down in terms of the budget, I will support, beyond what the Mayor has committed in his election in terms of taxes. I believe that we are at a point in the city where we have to make strategic investments. And I have said it publicly in the standing committee and I say it publicly here. So, Madam Speaker, I am supportive of this, but we have got a lot of work to do if we want to see the downtown become a place where people will want to live with their families in affordable housing. Because frankly, if I were a family and I needed affordable housing and I could choose to live one in Transcona or North Kildonan or in St. James or downtown, I know what the decision would be for my family and I know what your decision would be too if you were in the same circumstance. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins Madam Speaker, you know, I take up the challenge really seriously on turning the city around, in particular, when it comes to housing. You would expect me to say that, But today, I want to say that this is a good day for housing. This morning we released some of the projects that we are doing aligned with the Housing Accelerator Fund with partners like Dan Vandal and the Federal Government money has been really significant. And I know folks have been watching that. But you know what is also significant, is this project. And it is a good day for housing. It is a good day when we pass this for downtown. And you know, the leadership that has gone into that has been a bit of a journey. We were here, Madam Speaker, you and I certainly were, when a crowd came in opposed to the first iteration of the Portage Place redevelopment project. And many of those criticisms were about the lack of Indigenous-led in the downtown. And it is really key that we stand here today with celebrating, potentially, a unanimous vote that celebrates the TNFCO Inc., a not-for-profit organization, TNFCO 92, that is about the calls to action and the calls to justice, Madam Speaker. That is really exciting. And we have the leadership of Mark Chipman, Gavin Johnstone, Jim Ludlow, Kevin Donnelly, Glenda that was here this morning, Norva Riddell, Lorna Daniels, Don House, who I worked with at the Downtown BIZ. You know, Kevin Chief that Councillor Gilroy worked for, Madam Speaker, her old boss before he joined True North's team. We have Chief...Grand Chief Jerry Daniels, Madam Speaker, and his wonderful team at Southern Chiefs Organization: Joy Kramer, Jen Rattray. We are so lucky to have all this people power in this city working together to put our arms around, frankly, all of Council and the City of Winnipeg to get our super-huge challenges done together. And I am really excited about that, Madam Speaker. This Council, the people of Winnipeg, including the fabulous Executive Director of the YMCA downtown, Cordella, who came to talk to us about this project, her support for this project, and her capital plan that is turning the downtown around. The daycares that are going in across the street from each other from Wehwehneh, the Bay project at SCO, to this. The theaters that they are supporting. The green space, the community centres that I know Councillor Gilroy has always checked in, preceding beyond trust. Is that still there? It that still there? It is still there. 650 million, you do not get to say that price point every day. 1.2 million square feet, you do not get to say that every day. It is a remarkable day. And it is a remarkable day because we have a bit of an embarrassment of riches and we have worked really hard as a Council, I think, to get here. The Housing Accelerator Fund supporting Shoal Lake 90, Manitoba Inuit, Indigenous Ndinawe, These projects, over 200 Indigenous-led units, we got out the door this morning a couple of months ago when we put that together as a Council. We know we have more work to do, Madam Speaker. We really do. We know we have more partners to get out there and make sure that the Affordable Housing Now Program is picking up where the Housing Accelerator Program left off. And we know we have more work to do with amazing partners like Southern Chiefs, MMF, the Province of Manitoba, and indeed, some of the large business stakeholders like Mark Chipman who talked about the faith he has in the work we have to do and the hope in his heart and referenced Mayor Gillingham and Premier Kinew's collaborative relationship. That collaboration and that spirit, I think, we have embedded in many of the agenda items today from EPC, and maybe, you know, at 7:00 when we get down to Property and Development, if I stop talking, Madam Speaker. But it is exciting. And these milestones, while there is more work to do, we definitely should take hold of them, celebrate them as hard as we can just like my colleague in the downtown did when she did us all a favour and showcased Jim Ludlow, showcased True North at the Capital Cities Conference. Did we think we were going to get here when those Winnipeggers came in and we saw a precarious deal with Starlight fall over the last few years? Maybe not. But my glass is half full, Madam Speaker. I am really excited. The work that we produce this month was not just done this month, it was done over many hard months to get to respond to the housing crisis in a way that can fill Winnipeggers with the spirit of hope and the wind of change that we need to see. We know we need to do better. We know from every front-page article that might highlight something great like the Habitat for Humanity projects and the key ceremonies that Mayor Gillingham attended last week and highlight something that tests us, Madam Speaker, and holds the mirror up that Winnipeggers think that we are still averaging 50/50 on this as priority. This agenda, when moved to unanimously, will send a very strong message, Madam Speaker, that we believe in the Affordable Housing Now Program. We believe in the programs that we are working really hard to collaborate with other levels of government. As a level of government with the fiscal constraints that cities have and the lack of legislative powers that we have in enabling tools to draw down additional revenue. But today, an inspiring day. I cannot believe we are here, except I know the strength of Winnipeggers, I know the strength of leaders like Grand Chief Daniels and Mark Chipman and his strong, strong team. And I know, Madam Speaker, this month the strength of all of the Members of Councillors that have their eye on resolving the housing crisis, their eye on the prize. I trust it will be unanimous vote each and every time, Madam Speaker. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Rollins. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. It is a big day. This is going to be one of the most major changes ever so far in the history of downtown Winnipeg. It is symbolic that it be...we celebrating our Sesquicentennial, 150 years this year. And this is truly historic. And on that basis, well, I cannot help but look at it with a feeling of gravity because this is big. And we cannot ignore that. And why are we doing this? Why has it...why has it come to this? It is essentially a day for potential optimism. There is a lot of positivity going into this. Having said that, Madam Speaker, I have been around for awhile. I have been watching good leadership over the generations with more resources and

applying them. And still, our challenges continue. One thing I have been miss...I think missing from this conversation, well, a couple of Councillors did talk about it, this is an issue of gravity. This is big and this is heavy. And if it was not, we...this...I do not believe this would have happened, what we are doing now. We are trying to put as much positivity in this. And what does that mean in factuality when it comes to governments being involved with these joint ventures is we are trying to solve serious problems. I am not going to say...why would I say we are in a better position or greater leadership than ever before. I do not know. We are certainly not in a better economic situation. So, with humility, I hope we go and do this. With humility, understanding the problems we are trying to achieve...trying to solve. The issue of safety; Councillor Wyatt was quite right about issues of safety and who's kidding whom? It is absolutely the reality of it. And if we do not accept that, we are not really dealing. But we are trying to deal here, we are trying to do something, which means, although it has not been said by all Councillors in their speeches, we are trying to deal with these issues of safety. But that is a gigantic issue. And I do not believe any individual, any group or any government has ever solved those issues so simply or easily. And sometimes when it comes to a moment like this, we wish to gloss over it because it is such an unusual moment. Right now in this Council chamber, right now, in terms of what we are about to do. Bear in mind, we are doing this to try and solve some of the greatest problems in our society. And this is an expression of it. The downtown of a major Canadian city, and this is what it has come to. Now, just saying, this is what it has come to. Do not judge what I am saying whether it is bad or good, this is what it is come to, objectively. Regardless of how you feel about it, this is what it has come to. After 150 years, we are entering into a most unusual multi-lateral agreement. Private industry, various levels of government, and in this case, it is rather apt, and for the future, Indigenous government involved directly through the Southern Chiefs Organization. Because when we talk about safety, we are talking about something big. We are talking about...since we are using the term, the air of reconciliation. We use that term right now. It is the term to use right now. Reconciliation certainly is not new to our society, it has been going on for a long time, it is going to be going on for a long time for decades and generations to come. It certainly has not started a decade or two ago or a generation ago. But in the process of trying to understand how it is we solve problems of humanity, of human nature, we are doing that right now in downtown Winnipeg in a way that we have never been done before. And as Councillor...as Scott Gillingham had said, right, this is new. This is new for Canadian cities. That is where we are at. And I am going to say, you know when it comes to issues of safety, well, it is a big issue. But what I do know in some real way, in some real way that I cannot completely understand but I know it is very much part of it, it has to do with empowerment of the individual and self-identity, an identity of the empowerment of society. And who feels empowerment...our empowerment, who feels empowered, who is empowered. And that will decide how safe we are. And how do we achieve that empowerment for the individual, and how to define empowerment. But that is the issue. And do not think we are going to solve the issue of downtown Winnipeg or the problems of our society without dealing with that issue. You can call it different...different terms. You can call it poverty. Poverty and empowerment are essentially the same thing. What kind of poverty does one live in? What is their state of mind? What is their sense of empowerment? Where are they coming from? That they might influence whether people feel safe downtown. Now, I live a block from Redwood and Main and I walk, personally, I walk anywhere, anytime. I walk in my neighbourhood anytime. I walk from my house down Main Street to City Hall. Anytime I will walk in any neighbourhood anytime and I do. Ask around. Not everybody (inaudible) those that are watching, you know, to say it is...that is how I live. And I walk downtown at night. I am around Portage Place at night. It happens. And different reasons...I might be at the Convention Centre. I might be driving my son to the School of Music at U of W, walking around downtown for an hour waiting for his lesson to be over. A juxtaposition of empowerment, is it not? But that is exactly what I am talking about. And I will live that. We all live it one way or another. So, I am going to say in this moment of hope and positivity, do not forget in our humility the gravity of this because we are dealing with, and I am going to say it for the record because it is going to be...when all of us are gone from Council, and for those who are signing the agreements and this multi-lateral agreement today, and in public and private investment, when we are all sort of gone from this, oh, we will probably all...we will be alive. It is within very soon years. But the accountability to this agreement of which we are part today, the accountability to this in terms of how it affects our downtown Winnipeg will be a level of accountability that we have not seen before. So, bear that in mind. Because I said there is gravity to this. Because when people start questioning our...the safety of downtown Winnipeg, the investment of downtown Winnipeg, the importance and relevance of downtown Winnipeg to our city, our neighbourhood, we as a city, as taxpayers and citizens of this...of this city, and really, of this country. The future of this...what we start today, the future of this agreement, the future of this development, this project, this vision will be under, and I will say it one more time, will be under more scrutiny than anything else we have ever done regarding downtown Winnipeg ever. And with hope, I leave it at that. Thank you. Merci. Miigwech. (Inaudible).

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to take the opportunity to thank my colleagues for their comments. Also thank members of our Public Service, including Mr. Matt Dryburgh and his team, for their work not only in preparing this report, but all their work in advance of this with the developer and the applicant. I want to...I know it is late in the day already and we have got a long agenda to go, but I think it is a good opportunity, as I close this portion of this agenda item today, just to maybe touch on downtown for a minute. We can...and as someone, you know, has

referenced headlines, we can...we can open, you know, the papers or watch the news and what is going online and we see the frustration sometimes with members of the public who just think things are not moving too slow...or are not moving fast enough, that they are moving too slow and some, you know, display a kind of a level of pessimism that probably is not unsurprising. And I think for all of us we would say that we, too, want to see things moving faster. But I want to just remind all of us of the good work that we are doing. We are not where we need to be yet, at all. But when it comes to the downtown, people have asked me, you know, how do you tackle a downtown? Do you deal with homelessness challenges first or do you deal with crime first, or development first? What do you do first? And maybe it is not great, but the best response I can give is, have you ever watched Timbits soccer? Then you know what the swarm offense is all about, right? Where there is the ball, there is, you know, 16 kids or 20 kids or whatever all moving around the ball at the same time. And maybe it is not a great analogy, but it is the one I use. We are tackling it all at the same time. And permit me, just bear with me as I list some of the things that are being done right now, all simultaneously. On the issue of crime and safety; we have just invested in new community safety offices that are on our transit buses and around our transit stops. They are working in partnership with the Downtown Community Safety Partnership and the Bear Clan and the BIZ patrols, ambassadors, who are also working in partnership with the Winnipeg Police Service who have more foot patrol coming to our streets soon. In partnership with the Province of Manitoba, who most recently extended their funding for police services for the retail crime initiative and our businesses within our downtown including the Exchange District, Councillor Rollins' area, through Osborne Village are appreciative of the work of the Winnipeg Police Service. That is just some of the work that we have begun on safety. There is a better alignment and coordination. And the Downtown Community Safety Partnership is working in coordination with the Winnipeg Fire Paramedic Service. Now the Fire Paramedic Service, under the good leadership of our chief, Chief Schmidt, in partnership with Greg Burnett of the DCSP. The Fire Paramedic Service can dispatch calls to the DCSP to take some of the load off our fire paramedics. A lot of the calls, most of those calls are in the downtown. That is just on crime and safety. We have got a ways to go, but good work is happening because we are making the investment. On homelessness, there is a move towards coordination. I had a very good meeting with my Chief of Staff and Jared Baker from my office, the...who is dealing with homelessness and addiction. We had a really good meeting last week with Minister Bernadette Smith. It is yet another meeting with her. And we cannot steal their thunder, but suffice to say, they have given every indication, and they have given every indication publicly, that they are moving toward a substantial change in how we are addressing homelessness. And so, there is a coordination that is happening and a better coordination that is coming so that we can truly begin to make a dent on people who are living unsheltered. But look what we are doing here to do our part when it comes to addressing homelessness. Today we just announced the Housing Accelerator Fund's first round of successful applicants. If you take a look at the list, you got an e-mail this morning at 9:00 from our Public Service. The list, the 11 successful applicants, a lot of those applicants are in the downtown. A lot of those housing developments will be in the downtown. Some of them address things like the transformation of office buildings to retrofit them to change them to housing units. There is also units that will be built for those who are fleeing intimate partner violence. There is units there for youth who are vulnerable. There are units there that transform vacant parking lots within our downtown. So, there is...and I could go on and on. You see the list, it is substantial. A lot of it is development in our downtown. It is more housing in our downtown. That is to add to the Manitoba Métis Federation's investments at Portage and Main and at 200 Main. The Market Lands work that is going on right next door, we see it every day that we walk out of these...of the doors of this building. The University of Winnipeg Community Renewal Corporation; not only are they doing that project, they have other projects going on. If you have not been to Red River College campus recently, you need to go, it is beautiful. It is a significant investment in the downtown. Railyard at The Forks, they have received their permits to proceed. The Wawanesa Building just opened up. And, of course, we have before us Portage Place Mall. I am not done yet, let me carry on. We also have the...our arts organizations that are really beginning to reestablish themselves after COVID. So, in the downtown, consistently, you can see the Winnipeg Symphony Orchestra, the ballet, the theater, the opera. The Jets; their season starts again right away. The Goldeyes had a very successful run and came oh so close to a championship. But they had thousands of people here attending the downtown and, of course, we have talked about the Sea Bears and their attraction to the downtown. And the number of people that they are attracting into our downtown. Nuit Blanche takes place this weekend. We are doing so much collectively to improve the downtown, the point of the matter is, folks, it all takes time. But when True North and their partners and SCO and others, and when the people, other Mayors and Councillors that...Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Chambers hosted from the capital cities region, when they come into our community and say, there is some good things happening in the downtown, they are right. There is a reason they are saying that. We are not there yet. We have not got everything sorted out. But as we keep making these good decisions, incremental progress is being made. And when you begin to pile all this, one thing on top of the other on top of the other, I am very bullish on Winnipeg's downtown. I am very bullish on the future of our community. And today, we are making the right decision to make a big step forward through this development. And I look forward to everyone supporting it. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. With that, there is a call for a recorded vote. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Orlikow, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 16, Nays 0.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And the vote is unanimous. Moving on to the next agenda item, I will alert Council that we will take a short recess shortly after 4:00. There has been several requests from members around the chamber. I will call to that when we get there. Item 9, Madam Clerk. Item 7.

**Item 7 – Donation of the Ten Commandments Monument at Assiniboine Park to the
Fraternal Order of Eagles No. 23**

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. What I really wanted to put on the record is was what I already kind of asked in our delegations, just to thank our interim CAO, Mr. Sherwood Armbruster, for his willingness to work with the Assiniboine Park Conservancy in trying to find a good location for the Ten Commandments monument in the park, if possible. If not in the park, ultimately guaranteeing the goal is that it would still be remained in public space so people could view it, the monument, have access to it as well. So, I just...you know, that is the motion that we brought forward at EPC and I will be supporting that motion. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Mr. Mayor. Councillor Chambers. You did not this time. I got my eye on the ball. Councillor Chambers.

Councillor Chambers: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you. While the Ten Commandments has biblical references, there are nonreligious perspectives that merit discussion here at Council today, and specifically why it is...why it needs representation at Assiniboine Park is relevant. From a non-religious perspective, the Ten Commandments is an art monument. And the discussion before us here this morning serves as a foundational set of ethical principles that have served to shape societal norms and legal systems for centuries. These commandments address basic moral imperatives such as prohibiting theft, murder, dishonesty, which are essential to maintaining social order and trust within the community. In this way, they can be acknowledged as a framework that help individuals coexist peacefully by promoting behaviors that respect the rights and well-being of others. Beyond the individual, the Ten Commandments also emphasizes responsibilities to the broader community. For example, the Ten Commandments states to honour one's parents. That can be viewed as reinforcement of social structures that support family bonds and generational continuity. The principles of fairness and respect in relationships as reflected in the prohibitions against coveting, encouraging a sense of justice and equality in interpersonal interactions. These values help create a stable and cohesive community by promoting integrity and mutual respect. Finally, the Ten Commandments addressing societal integrity, such as guidelines against false testimony, have been particularly influential in shaping our model...modern legal systems. Trust and honesty are critical to the functioning of courts, business, and governments. When these ethical principles are codified into law, they help ensure that institutions operate justly and transparently. In this...in this, what we want in the Ten Commandments transcends religious origins and contributes to the development of universal human values that promote a stable and just society. For me, my favourite...or closely followed Ten Commandment is honour thy mother and thy father, that their days may be long upon the earth. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Chambers. Councillor Wyatt, followed by Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Wyatt: In light of the request by Members of Council, I will keep my comments brief. I just would like to thank the delegations who came here today to speak to the item and Gail Asper for her persistence on this. She definitely...her persistence overcomes resistance, there is no doubt about it. She is that individual that is like that and very dedicated to her city over the years. And so, when she comes and speaks, I think we all definitely listen to her and take what she says with great consideration. And I had a chance to chat with her informally after her delegation. She was actually...the thought of...other than the Assiniboine Park, the thought of having the Ten Commandments in front of the law courts, actually, was something that she actually smiled upon very strongly. She thought it was an interesting concept. She never...never really struck her as an idea. But...and I do believe we control the right-of-way there, if not part of it, if not all of it. But nonetheless, the Province, possibly. I think it is something that is worthy. It is interesting the

Ten Commandments are actually in Kildonan Park. And so, they are kind of hidden. And apparently, they are up on the other side of the pavilion in the lake there. But I am not too sure why APC made...has made a concern about it. It seems somewhat unnecessary to get to this level, but it is what it is. I have always thought that the Ten Commandments should be there along with the Beatitudes, that is my own personal view. You know, blessed are those who mourn, for they will be comforted. Blessed are the meek for they shall inherit the earth. You have heard of those. They are basically, you know, it is like...it is words to live by, I think was what Councillor Chambers was also saying. And I do not think...I do not necessarily see it as religious item. I see it as a...as values in terms of how to live your life and follow to be a...to be a good neighbor, you know. To be your brother's keeper, so to speak, and your neighbours. So, you know, Madam Speaker, I hope that this can be dealt with quickly by EPC and I am glad that EPC has gotten involved. That the JNF dinner, which was a number of months ago, she...Gail Asper made a beeline for myself to talk about this issue and raise it. So, I am glad that it is being addressed. And hopefully, it can be addressed quickly. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I essentially agree with all the words from the previous speakers: Councillor Marcus Chambers, Councillor Russ Wyatt. I see no contradiction. I will be supporting this as well. Essentially, no contradiction. It is an interesting conversation that we have had this morning because we are talking about something that is deep. In fact, in a sense, it transcends religion, I think, is part of what both Marcus Chambers and Russ Wyatt were saying. In fact, previous Councillors this morning in delegation and our delegates. This is bigger than any one religion and that is what I was making the point today. Having met people in their own environments around the world over the decades, over five continents, what do people have in common? What are the differences? But this sort of transcends. Once again, this transcends. And I mean it. This is not metaphorical. These things of which we speak, these...well, in this case, I have to admit it, it is in...wrapped in religion, in this case, as call it, the Ten Commandments. However, these concepts do transcend time and space. Not metaphorically, they transcend time, thousands of years. And they transcend space, human space, throughout the world. If you look around the world, you will find that most societies have adapted certain kinds of ethics of conduct and rules. That is what society does. That is when you have society, as a matter of fact. Perhaps that is a bias, but I would say that is just a matter of nuance of perspective. And so, I do not want to get too philosophical today, but it does get a little bit philosophical, and we do deal with esoteric concepts here even at the municipal level. Or, in fact, we are the least esoteric level of government. Our...whether we like it or not, we are sort of money in, money out, where does the money go? The extent we are dealing with other things it is much less than the other levels...levels of government. Having said that, in this case, we are dealing with a piece of...sort of small little piece of history in a park. And it comes to something as deep as what words are allowed and how they are allowed in the park. Because in this case, it does represent a religion. The Ten Commandments infer, including the first commandment, about not honouring another deity. And therefore, it has religious connotations. I did ask the question this morning with the people in delegation, with Ed Hume and Gail Asper, how do they feel about other religions being represented in the parks. And Ed Hume did get a chance to answer this is a pluralistic society. So, once we allow this here, not because there are concepts that we believe in that they essentially are an expression of human nature throughout the world, one way or the other. We all accept that I am pretty sure, but once we accept them as an aspect of a specific religion or group of religions, whether it be Judaea-Christian or Abrahamic, whether it would be allowing other religions. The answer by Ed Hume was, in his opinion, as the delegate here, that we are living in a pluralistic society. So, I am going to have to admit, that if we do allow this in a public place, and I am not saying it is wrong, I will be voting for this, we also have to accept the fact that there will be further discussion on this type of issue going forward because of the decision we make today. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers on this item? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I will try to be brief. Yes, clearly, it is religious. To say this is somehow transit...transcends religion is just...come on. I mean, it is the Ten Commandments. It is pretty clearly a Christian document. That said, the best arguments...Councillor Schreyer makes a good point in terms of what Ed Hume said. Okay, we want to argue whether this is religious or not? I mean, I got all day. Let's hear it. Fine. Frankly, it would be more interesting to debate the topics...assertions that this is universal. Does anything...does anything approach universality in terms of religious faith, or that arguably would be a pretty good, interesting debate. That is not the debate at hand, unfortunately. The debate at hand is what to do with this monument. Yes, it is a pluralistic society. We continue to have the prayer here. I have quoted the Quran, I have quoted the Bible, I have quoted Leonard Cohen. People...Lukes has done Buddhist stuff; people have done all sorts of different things. I kind of like it. It shows diversity instead of just pretending this does not exist. I think there is a parallel here. There is a totem pole in the park. Could there not be room somewhere for something like this and for some other recognitions? We have...in Brandon, they have a labyrinth of peace where I just took my wife 25 years ago, 20 years ago. All sorts of different religions recognized each with its own symbol. So, I think we could do something like that and recognize diversity of religious opinions. Certainly, their beliefs. Certainly, there is a lot of that now in the city, much more than when this was donated. But what I really rise to do, I feel like people are taking shots here at AP...APC board and probably no one has done that more than I have over the years, frankly, and

had some pretty all out arguments. But then, also, I think, took the side of the APC when they had the legal situation on their side. So, I think Margaret Redmond and now Ray Karasevich and Bruce Keats who is the COO have, really, tried to deal with this in a responsible manner. I have no memory...Duncan's been at board meetings with me, Morantz was there, Pagtakhan was there, I do not know who all. I have been on this thing with any number of other Councillors, no one ever said throw it in the garbage. No one ever said, you know, anything dismissive about it. They wrestled with, somebody complained about it, what do you do? I think I was the one who said refer it to Welcoming Winnipeg because it is still a city park. It is somewhat arms-length, certainly, the collective agreements are seen as being with a separate employer. So, I think there was a good faith effort here to try and come up with some solution to the problem. It is a religious monument. Does that make it something we have to remove? No. I argue, no, it does not. So, we can find some spot for it, as long as...if we have found a spot for the totem pole, I think we can probably find a spot for this and celebrate religious diversity, I think, rather than trying to eliminate all representations. On the other hand, I certainly hope we do not have to keep dealing with this because let's be honest, there was a 55 million dollars cost overrun on the Leaf project and I do not think we have ever debated that or called for any sort of investigation into that. So, it is all wrapped up in litigation, still, that will hopefully...hopefully get resolved. But let's try and move forward on this. And the EPC suggestion at least hopefully gets us out of the quagmire and gets us to a resolution. But I think I owe it, at least, I think my term at APC is winding up, but I do think I owe it, at least, to the new...to Ray Karasevich and Bruce and some of the other people there, to say, I think there was a good faith effort here to try and solve problems. But luckily, we seem to have something on the table that we can all agree on.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And Mr. Mayor, over to you to close.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank my colleagues for their comments. I want to echo what Councillor Mayes has said, certainly, about APC. My recent conversation with them, there is certainly willingness on their part to say, look, we will do our part to, you know, to assist...not to assist, but we will do our part to work with the CAO to find a good resolution for this. So, thank you to everybody. I appreciate the comments today.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Next is Item 9.

Item 9 – Proposed Grant Intake and Review Process

Madam Speaker: We have a few motions that go with this item. We will be breaking shortly, but let's just get through a few more speakers first. So, it is Item 9. We have amending Motion 2 and that...that is moved by Councillor Gilroy, seconded by Councillor Orlikow. Councillor Gilroy, you would like to withdraw that motion? And we...yes, we have the concurrence of your seconder, Councillor Orlikow? Okay. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Amending Motion 2 is withdrawn. Same thing for amending Motion 8. We have heard from Councillor Gilroy and Councillor Orlikow to withdraw that. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And we have Motion 10, moved by Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Gilroy that will go with this item. Okay. With that, Mr. Mayor, do you wish to introduce the item?

Motion No. 2 **Moved by Gilroy,** **Seconded by Orlikow,**

WHEREAS Council representation on a committee that recommends grants has a significant impact on the decision of which organizations receive grant funding;

AND WHEREAS the significance of deciding which elected officials are members of the evaluation committee should require appointment of at least two members by Council;

AND WHEREAS it is appropriate for the Mayor to have the ability to have a member of the Executive Policy Committee as a representative;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 9 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17, 2024, be amended by deleting Recommendation 1.B., and replacing with the following:

"B. In section 8(1), delete clauses (b) (c) and (d) and replace with the following:

"(b) Three members of the Winnipeg Public Service, to be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer"

- Renumber the remaining clause accordingly*

Motion No. 8
Moved by Gilroy,
Seconded by Orlikow,

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 9 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17, 2024, be amended by deleting Recommendation 1.B., and replacing with the following:

"B. In section 8(1), delete clauses (b) (c) and (d) and replace with the following:

"(b) Three members of the Winnipeg Public Service, to be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer"

• Renumber the remaining clause accordingly

Mayor Gillingham: Simply, I want to thank...just briefly thank the delegate.

Councillor Orlikow: I am a little confused, there is so many of them. 8, no. We do not want to waive that one.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Councillor...Councillor Gilroy asked for it to be withdrawn...

Councillor Orlikow: ...No, I do not think she did...

Madam Speaker: ...She did say 2 and 8. She did say 2 and 8...

Councillor Orlikow: ...Would you clarify? I do not believe that is accurate...

Madam Speaker: ...Councillor Gilroy, you did say that or we voted on it.

Councillor Gilroy: I thought...I thought that the motion incumbents everything.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Okay, we voted on withdrawing those two and there is a new motion.

Councillor Mayes: We can incorporate some of their.

Councillor Eadie: Apparently, Motion 10 covers all aspects.

Councillor Orlikow: Oh, sure. Sorry, did not see that. Thank you. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay, thank you. Mr. Mayor, your opportunity to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the delegates who came forward today at the EPC and have come in the past, as well. I want to thank my colleagues, certainly Councillor Browaty, Councillor Gilroy, (inaudible) for Motion 10 that is before us. I am going to let them introduce that and I think that is all that we need to vote on. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. And with that, we can take a recess. Councillor Browaty, unless you would...yes, we will take a recess now and we will reconvene in about 10 minutes, okay? Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 26, 2024, at 4:34 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: Good afternoon. I would like to reconvene our Council meeting after a short recess. It is September 26, 2024. We are on the reports of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17th Item 9. Councillor Browaty, your opportunity to introduce your amending motion.

Motion No. 10

**Moved by Councillor Browaty,
 Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Item 9 of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated September 17, 2024, be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendations 1 and 2 in their entirety and replace with the following:*
 - "1. That Council enact the Community and Neighbourhood Grant Program By-law, a draft of which is attached as Appendix 1 to this report, with the following amendments:*
 - A. In the first WHEREAS clause, delete "2025" and replace with "2026".*
 - B. Delete clauses 6(1)(a) & (b) and renumber the remaining clauses accordingly.*
 - C. Delete clauses 8(1)(b) (c) & (d) replace with the following:*
 - "(b) Three members of the Winnipeg Public Service, to be appointed by the Chief Administrative Officer and subsequently referred to as Grant Officers for the purposes of this committee", and renumber the remaining clause accordingly.*
 - 2. That the by-law become effective January 1, 2026.*
 - 3. That the following be referred to the 2025 Multi-year Budget Update process:*
 - A. That 2024 grant recipients, listed in Appendix 3, receive the same levels of grant support in 2025.*
 - B. Additional CNGP grant funding in the amount of \$2,140,000 allocated to the following funding streams for 2026 & 2027:*
 - i. \$160,000 for Arts & Culture*
 - ii. \$1,700,000 for Community Well-being*
 - iii. \$140,000 for Environment/Green City*
 - iv. \$140,000 for Recreation*
 - 4. That the Public Service be directed to review the process and report back with any proposed changes by June of 2027, in advance of the 2028-2031 Multi-year Budget Process.*
- *Renumber the remaining recommendation accordingly*

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. The motion before you here does something that sort of reverses something we did in 2024 multi-year budget. Upon reflection, the work of many community groups in this community are very important. You know, it is interesting, you know, when we looked during the budget process at the whole grants piece, there were some grants that were long-term contractual obligations. There was a pile of grants where we returned a service that the City of Winnipeg would other deliver, things like bus shack cleaning, graffiti removal. And we recognize that, hey, you know, if we did not provide that grant, we would have to be providing that service internally. We had an interesting group. I met with one particularly interesting group this summer and I made that argument to them. It is like, hey, you know, we were trying to find a savings to, you know, make sure that other core municipal services were delivered. But the reality is, we do provide community services. We have community centres, we have libraries, we have swimming pools, recreation. In a time when we are seeing an explosion of crime and problems in our city, it was not the appropriate time for us to be cutting back on these amenities. So, thank you to everybody who has come and presented to us. The motion before us here today restores the money that was previously allocated and for 2025, we will do status quo on the grants that are already out there. So, all the groups out there that are doing good work for the city, it will maintain that. And the new grant process that we have been discussing for some time and maybe still has some tweaking to do will be rolled out for 2026 so that there is a lot of predictability and a lot of consistency. The other piece that was not part of the original proposal was to have a number of members of Council be involved in that decision-making process. After further review and further consideration and a motion that has been coming forward from Councillors Gilroy and Councillor Orlikow, this motion combines that recommendation that, in fact, it will be the CAO's office and certain key individuals in the Public Service that will be involved in making those

decisions. So, again, I thank the community groups that have come out and spoken. I thank you to all my colleagues for all of their thoughtful comments. I look forward to any comments you have here on the floor at Council. So, thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Of course, I seconded this motion. I do rise in support of what we have here in front of us here today. I just want to do...I do want to share, like, a concern that I do have that I will be kind of following up with the Mayor on. I have...me and him have connected on this. But one of the concerns, a big concern that I have, is it is very unclear about all of the consolidations to these grants. There is appendix two, there is appendix three, there is many different grants, some are long-term funding, some are short-term funding, some are really city...City-run grants like the GWCC. So, it is very unclear on if all of these grants will be going through this same process and if they will have to compete against each other. I am really hoping that they do not have to compete against each other. I am really hoping that we have a separate pocket of community grant funds that will have the grant process, but grants that we decide as a city, like our Library Board, like GWCC, should be very...kept very separate because those are things that we as a city have a real big role in. And making sure that we fund our community centres means we do not have to have staff doing that work. So, I do...I do not want to see them competing with the community organizations for this funding or vice versa. So, that is my big concern, and it is very unclear, in this process, how that is going to be aligned. We have three...we have appendices with many different grants on it. And so, it is unclear if all of these grants have to be going through the same process. So, that is what I am going to be trying to get. I am supporting this moving forward, but that will be something that I will be keep dialoguing on and trying...if that is the case, trying to change, because I do not think that is a very fair or equitable process to have. And quite frankly, something that we would not want to lose important, valuable city services...services on. So, that is...but I do...I do want to thank the Mayor and thank Councillor Browaty for helping to support this motion. Making sure that we are listening to the community on what they need is vital. So, now what we heard this morning with Kate Kehler, now we will see that those community organizations that are having to go through a new process won't have to deal with it, this grant...this 2025. They will have to be prepared for the next one, but it gives them some time to be able to understand what this process is all about, us to communicate it a little bit better. And also, for the ability to ensure that there is no...like, of course, we heard here today, there is always going to be political issues around people wanting grants, people trying to add grants. But what we do not want to see is that once the grants are being decided, it should not be dealt with at the political level, it should be taken out of our hands so the administration has a very clear picture on, A) what we did as a strat plan, and making sure that aligns with that without any kind of political interference. And that is what we are doing here today. So, I feel that we...that the Mayor has, and Councillor Browaty has, listened to the community on what some of the...some of what they are asking, and I think that that is really important when we are making decisions. So, I want to thank them for that. Happy to support and looking forward to working with him further on the grant process and ensuring that we are not...we are not hindering some of the important services we do at the City like our General Councils of Community Centres, like our library boards or other programs and services that the City has really...that is under the umbrella of the City. So, hoping to dialogue further, but thank you very much for your...for your working with us on this issue. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Gilroy. Any further speakers? Councillor Wyatt, then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, I rise, Madam Speaker, to say that I appreciate everything Councillor Gilroy's done. And I want to thank her for following up on this matter with the Executive Committee. And some of the changes included, though, I cannot support the clause going forward. I can support the amendments to the clause. Though, clause C...D...item B in terms of now deleting the elected representation participation and replacing it all with the administration, I have concerns about. I think that when it comes...if Council wants to micromanage or develop a whole new process in terms of administering these grants, which is really what is being recommended here, that Council should also have the courage to be part of the process in terms of allocating these grants. In other words, Madam Speaker, the grants are important. They are important organizations. They all originated, not at the administration, they originated politically on the floor of Council here over the years. One grant after another. And if Council wishes to revise them or change them or allocate them differently, there should also be a political lens, not just an administrative ends...lens, if you are proposing a whole new process. Frankly, I think we are creating a lot of red tape. A lot of red tape for these groups that they never went through. And what I find ironic about this, Madam Speaker, is this is not the big money when it comes to our grants. And the Chair of Finance knows this. The big money, when it comes to our grants, are groups like the Convention Centre getting millions or Economic Development Winnipeg getting millions. Or the True North, the True North who we grant back their entertainment tax. We did that deal not when they had the Jets, but when they were the Moose. We have not revisited that, nor had the courage to revisit that. And that is millions of dollars going back to a privately-owned entertainment facility. Wonderful for economic development for the city, but you know, maybe it is something that could be revisited. But we have no courage when it comes to those millions of dollars, but we can pick on the little community groups and throw a whole new red tape process in their face, which is really what this is doing. No, I won't be supporting this. Especially since we do not have the courage to challenge those other grants. If we think all the grants are a

problem and the grants have now escalated tens of millions of dollars compared to what they were before, then let's have the courage and look at all of them and put a new process in for them as well. Not just the small guys. Not just little guys who are getting five or 10,000 dollars, but the ones who are getting millions of dollars. If anything, that is where the lens should be. That is where we could actually find real savings, if possible, when it comes to grants. Not picking on small community groups by putting them through a whole new red tape process, which really is what we are proposing to do now. That is what this is doing. I cannot support that, Madam Speaker, considering that we are not prepared to do it with the big ones, and that we are going to basically make them subject to this. And frankly, I think, you know, making it as subject to the administration alone, I respect the administration's opinion on things, but at the end of the day, you as well as I do know that sometimes we will make a different recommendation than the Public Service because of the good of the community that we know and that we are accountable for. So, that is my concern, as well. I want to thank...again, I am glad to see the clause being struck. It appears to me...and again, really uncomfortable making motions like this on the fly where we are making massive amendments to a by-law. And again, I think it would be better to send it back, clean it up, clean up the report, remove the elements of the report that right now still read that we are making ineligible operating grants, but then you are now with this amendment, we are actually taking that out by deleting it. Again, Madam Speaker, it seems that we are all over the map on this report. It seems rather rushed. And maybe the best thing would have done...when those students came out here, I think it was in May of the Council meeting, first thing in the morning, we just say, look, we got it wrong. We got it wrong. We are going to file this under G. We have done that with many other reports. A lot of them are far more worthy than this that we should have been acting upon, right? Let's just file it and move on. And we got the budget wrong because it was actually part of the budget, but nobody told anybody that it was part of the budget. And if we had been open and transparent and actually told these groups that we just passed a budget, by the way, that we are eliminating your grants, I think they probably would have been down here during the budget process itself. But of course, none of them knew that because none of them were advised of that fact because we chose not to tell them. We chose to tell them later on when they blew up and showed up in our courtyard here one morning prior to Council. And then, everybody went running for the hills, rightfully so. Anyway, those are my comments, Madam Speaker. Thank you. And I want to thank the young people who showed up this...that morning to show the courage with their drums and it inspired...it caused me a moment of reflection about my youth when I was protesting in the streets. Whether it be for...against free trade or for world peace with the Walk for Peace. And I was very moved and inspired by the young people who came and spoke out so passionately that morning. It gave me a great sense of hope for the future when I saw them, not...when they are there together supported by all...by each other, their different groups and organizations. And that they...that those are individuals who on a daily basis do a ton of things to make our city more livable. Sometimes we do not really see them. We do not see them front and centre, and they are doing the work quite quietly, but on the front lines of the city and some of the challenges that I spoke about earlier. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Eadie, followed by Councillor Santos.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise...well, I am a little bit concerned. I rise in support of the amendment because I believe it is just amending the EPC recommendations and leaving alone EPC's recommendation to allow operating funds to deliver whatever program or project or whatever they are delivering under their application, Madam Speaker. But...and I...you know, it is doing things on the fly. What I am going to be speaking about shortly, I do not want to really do it on the fly. But I will mention, if anybody actually spent the time to read the detail of the EPC recommendations, the whatever it was; four, five, six pages. One...one set for operating, one set for capital. And in there, that is where you would find out that they were moving forward with this process for grants. Now, what I was disappointed to see is...well, there was the operating...and it was like the only thing...like, we allocate budgets, Madam Speaker. And that is what Council should be concerned with. And if we allocate the budgets and we also acknowledge those budgets need to deal with our Strategic Priorities Action Plan, groups, and whatever they are trying to achieve, especially if they are delivering some kind of service through a grant that is directly related to the mandate of a city. I think that is very important. Like, art programs and stuff, those...you know, I participated in an art program out of the community centres back in the '60s, '70s. Well, not so much '70s, '60s. Anyway, that kind of thing, that is what cities did and the funding to do...for community centres to deliver that, it came from the city budget. And it was allowing us to deliver the mandate we have under recreation or whatever...what have you. Community development and all those kind of things, those were within our mandate. They had been eroded through the budget, Madam Speaker. But anyway, so my biggest concern is when I look at the list. Now, I think it is in our perspective if we go forward, we can amend what that committee is going to deal with when looking at applications. But let me start with, as I mentioned, while the Winnipeg Public Library has been considered a grant, it is not an external organization. It is an advisory board that is part of the Winnipeg Public Library system. Our responsibility. And why they would have to apply each year, although they do report each year how they spend their money. We get those reports at Community Services. It should not be in the list. I want to point out another thing, there is a GCWCC grant to maintain athletic fields for 30G. Now, you know, the athletic fields are actually a part of the City system. They are maintaining fields owned by the City. And did you know, I think you know, you have got kids that played soccer or whatever, well, every one of those kids when they are playing, there is a fee to play on a City field. And that money goes to Public Works and they are supposed to maintain it. And

they are not able to because we do not give them the budget to do it. Nobody wants to jack the fees for that. But what happened is, GCWCC took over taking care of some athletic fields. Why you want to...like, that is something the City is supposed to do. It is our athletic fields. Not nobody else's. It should not be in there. Now, we have a whole housing plan and everything and we have for decades and decades and decades. Winnipeg Housing Rehab Corp has been getting a grant from the City so that we are supporting not-for-profit housing for people in Winnipeg because today's crisis is yesterday's crisis but not as big. There needs to be affordable housing for the people, well, who are not making living wage, Madam Speaker. Whatever, anyway. So, I am just pointing these out that at some point, we have got to take those out. They should not be part of this system. This system is more about external organizations delivering programs or projects or whatever it is. And not unlike some of our capital programs, should be...should we put a whole thing on capital programs or refunding CIGP for not...NGOs doing things that are important in our neighbourhoods. I know community centres have gotten CIGP from the Mynarski Ward CIGP fund, you know. So, those are City-owned assets, Madam Speaker. Anyway, so I just wanted to point that out and that, from my perspective, it is not all an individual project. Now, Councillor Pagtakhan brought the Pan Am Boxing Club over into the old...we decommissioned the Boyd Park Community Centre decades and decades ago. It was a family centre, the people were trying to run it. It is still there, the City still owns it, actually. And they are delivering a boxing program where they help the teenagers study, eat, and box. Learn about what it takes to have structure to ensure they are going to have success in life. Because what happens is, when you get anarchy and craziness on the street, 14-year-olds are stabbing people to death. That is why these grants are so important. So, just remember that. So, we should be, as Council, more interested in increasing the amount of grants that we give to organizations who are delivering things that the City really should be delivering but we have not because over the years, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut, cut. And maybe we will see some change into the future if we do this properly. And the administration understands the problem out there. And so, they are going to have to figure out how to divide up or allocate money. But when we have things that are related to...well, the City does not want to do its job, so athletic fields are being maintained by GCWCC. Whatever. Anyway, I am voting for the amendment. And I am going to wait a bit, but I think there is an opportunity in the future to change that list of organization...well, the Winnipeg Public Library Advisory Board is a board of the city. So, the organization you are talking about cutting is the City of Winnipeg and the library system. Like...Anyway, so hopefully we can amend that in the future.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Santos.

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Just pulling up my notes here. Okay, so today we are at a crucial juncture where we have an opportunity to reshape our city grants and how they are awarded. Ensuring that they better align with the 2022 to 2026 Strategic Action Plan. This amendment is about much more than policy. It is about creating a more open, transparent, and inclusive process that will benefit the entire community. For two decades, probably longer, this operating grant has been handed out in a way that remained largely stagnant. Many deserving, young, innovative organizations were unable to apply and that is something we need to change. I understand that change can be difficult, especially after so many years of operating in a particular way. But this is an opportune moment to adapt and improve. I want to take a moment to sincerely thank the Mayor and the EPC Committee for taking the time over the summer months to pause and engage in the further discussions about this important policy. Their leadership and commitment to listening to the community have been crucial. That is why I am fully supportive of restoring the grant funding to 2024 levels making the program whole again. This is a critical step in ensuring the programs sustainability and this amendment has been referred to the 2025 multi-year budget update for further consideration. But we want to note that bringing the funding back to these levels are not just about maintaining the status quo, we are reaffirming our commitment to supporting essential community programming that makes a real difference in people's lives. The other amendment that I moved at EPC last week, addresses section 6.1, deleting the restriction against operating costs. We know that programming in a community space is essential to the wellbeing of our residences and we must provide these organizations with the flexibility to apply for operating grants ensuring that they have the resources to continue their vital work. This is all about fairness. It is about opening doors for organizations that could never access these grants in the past. By establishing a new evaluation committee and making the application process more transparent, we are setting the stage for a more equitable distribution of resources that truly reflects the needs and priorities of our community. Now, while we are making the process...excuse me, now, while we are making progress, we acknowledge that this policy is not perfect. There will always be areas that need refining and I am committed to continue to work together with my Council colleagues and community leaders to have an ongoing conversation. This will allow us to review and amend and the policy as needed ensuring that it continues to meet the evolving needs of our city and its people. We are in a unique position to make meaningful change and I am confident with these amendments will allow us to support the programs in the meantime and organizations that form the backbone of our city's social fabric. Therefore, I am going to be supporting this amending motion with Councillor Browaty and seconded by Councillor Gilroy. Really appreciate their ongoing work to...in collaboration. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Browaty, do you wish to close? Okay. Mr. Mayor? I can call the question.

Mayor Gillingham: You can call the question, please, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Let's first vote on the amending Motion 10. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the main item, as amended. All in favour, please rise. Madam Clerk.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillor Wyatt.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 14, Nays 1.

Madam Speaker: Item 9 passes, as amended. Councillor Orlikow absent. Okay. Next item, Madam Clerk.

Item 19 – Delegated Authority for Occasional Liquor Permits and Extensions of Hours

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor, to introduce the item.

Mayor Gillingham: Seeing the late hour, I will limit my comments on this one and just defer to my colleague from Transcona.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: The liquor motion?

Madam Speaker: Yes.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, so I stood it down, Madam Speaker. It is a junior member of Council...or newer member of Council recommending that we delegate this to the Clerks. I think this still has a useful role at community committee. Sometimes we deal with issues where we need to put a recommendation on a request and that could easily be missed with delegated authority and when does not have to appear on an agenda to actually be addressed. And so, even though I am sure it is being recommended for time and space in terms of approving these things quicker, the reality is often we have had issues with events. And sometimes having it before the Community Committee, not delegated authority, but through the Community Committee, is important to establish some rules around a request. And so, I would not support this recommendation and would suggest that maybe the mover and movers should really look at examples where this has been a concern in the past before they decide quickly to make such a procedural change. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Duncan.

Councillor Duncan: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Yes, this came from the Assiniboia Community Committee. And just to give some background to those that are deciding not to eat dinner and listen to Council on this Thursday. Typically, Councillors will get an e-mail regarding an event in their community that they would agree to in principle to approve these types of permits. And then months later, after the event has taken place, we would see these appear on our agendas at Community Committee, which seems redundant. And I am still inquiring and I had up until the point that we put this forward on why that would happen. I am not sure that you can deny something that had already happened, but nonetheless, put this fix in place and allow for the Clerk or their delegate to consult. And for my colleagues who might be concerned about points that Councillor Wyatt has brought up, to consult with the relevant ward Councillor on this prior to giving authority. So, I do appreciate the comments. And the intent here is to make this a quicker process for folks and to make sure that our agenda items at Community Committee are relevant to the needs of the community at that time. Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay. Mr. Mayor, to close...

Mayor Gillingham: ...I simply want to rise to thank Councillors Dobson, Duncan and Lukes of the Assiniboia Community Committee for bringing this forward. I am glad to support it.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question. All in favour of Item 19? I will be recorded in opposition, as well. Thank you. Okay, and that is carried. Next, we move onto by-laws for first reading only. Pardon me. Hang on, one second. Yes. No. Yes, no, we have more motions. There is a whole pile here, Mr. Mayor. Okay, Item 6; it is moved by Councillor Wyatt, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It is a notice of motion regarding the remote work policy. It will appear on next month's agenda. We have Motion 9; moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It is regarding parking at City Hall. Also will appear on next month's agenda. Item 12... Motion 12 is moved by Councillor Schreyer, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. It is a notice of motion. It is regarding titles of motions put before Council. That will also appear on next month's agenda. And that concludes our motions. Mr. Mayor, onto by-laws.

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 6
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

WHEREAS during the Pandemic it was necessary to institute a work from home policy to encourage social distancing and to limit the spread of COVID-19;

AND WHEREAS the Pandemic has now been over for some time, yet thousands of City of Winnipeg employees are still working from home;

AND WHEREAS the City owns, leases and operates tens of thousands of office square feet that are presently sitting vacant, costing ratepayers and demonstrating a practice of the inefficient use of tax dollars;

AND WHEREAS much of these empty offices are in Downtown Winnipeg, which contradicts the decision by Council to make Downtown Winnipeg revitalization a priority in the recently passed Strategic Priorities Action Plan;

AND WHEREAS it has been demonstrated in studies conducted that worker productivity falls significantly when employees are not working from traditional office spaces, not to mention the synergy lost for opportunities that exist in common work spaces, such as mentoring, training, and general supervision conducted via employee peers and management;

AND WHEREAS City staff continue to work from home or their cottage;

AND WHEREAS to date, the Chief Administrative Officer has not issued a 'Back to the Office' directive to all City employees;

AND WHEREAS we have a new Acting Chief Administrative Officer who can issue an immediate directive to require staff to return to the office.

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that Council immediately direct the Chief Administrative Officer to end the work from home practice and to issue a directive to all city employees to return to their respective offices.

Motion No. 9
Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,

WHEREAS members of the public are now requested to come to City Hall for all matters, such as public hearings at Community Committee;

AND WHEREAS at one time Community Committees were actually held in the Community and not at City Hall;

AND WHEREAS with all members of the public having to come to City Hall for community committee meetings, the residents of the City are subject to parking restrictions and paid parking, when before parking was free, and that members of the public have had their vehicles towed during public hearings that can sometimes be very lengthy in time;

AND WHEREAS the City presently offers zero options for food, snacks, coffee or bottled drinks and water;

AND WHEREAS the City of Winnipeg will cordon off parking for movie productions and music concerts to allow for their delivery of their product;

AND WHEREAS citizens are just as important and their input at a public hearing is instrumental in the democratic public hearing process;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Governance Committee of Council be directed to report back on the following:

1. *The establishment of free parking next to and around City Hall, with residents being informed in advance or any meeting and that security staff also be available in the event residents need a safety escort to their vehicle.*
2. *The establishment drink, coffee, tea and snack machines inside City Hall for the public.*

Motion No. 12

**Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
 Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

WHEREAS motion titles can be confusing with often no ability to find out why, how or by whom the titles of motions are decided;

AND WHEREAS this can lead to a misperception as to what a motion is about;

AND WHEREAS this can also lead to a misunderstanding as to how the intent of a motion was derived;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the following be referred to the Governance Committee of Council:

1. *That the Procedure By-law be amended to ensure that any motion, or motion to amend, shall be titled, and the authors of any motion will have the ability over said matter.*

**EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
 CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READING ONLY**

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 95/2024, by-law...

Madam Speaker: ...Mr. Mayor, we have a conflict declared by Councillor Wyatt, so we will deal with...Councillor Wyatt, go ahead...

Councillor Wyatt: ...I would like to declare a future conflict, financial, 103/2024.

Madam Speaker: Okay. We will deal with that item first. Thank you. Let's let Councillor Wyatt depart from the chamber. Just 103/2024, Mr. Mayor, then for first reading only.

Mayor Gillingham: Certainly. So just...okay. So I will just...alright...

Madam Speaker: ...Just that one.

Mayor Gillingham: Alright. Then I would move that the following by-law be read a first time: By-law No. 103/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 103/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. We will now go back to others for first reading, and then we can move onto second and third readings.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, just to be...

Madam Speaker: He will be right here in just a moment.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, to be clear, Madam Speaker, then we are dealing now with By-law 95?

Madam Speaker: That is correct.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: I will wait until my colleague is in place. And I will now move the following by-law be read a first time: By-law 95/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 95/2024.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-laws be read a second time: By-law No. 19/2024, By-law 72/2024, By-law 90/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 19/2024, By-law No. 72/2024, By-law No. 90/2024.

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the By-law Nos. 19/2024, 72/2024, and 90/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Mayor Gillingham: I move that the following by-laws read a first time: By-law No. 102/2024, 104/2024, 109/2024, 111...

Madam Speaker: ...Yes, not 111, because we did pass an amending motion. We will take out 111. Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, so then 102, 104, 109, as I stated, please be read a first time. Thank you...

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 102/2024, By-law No. 104/2024, By-law No. 109/2024.

Mayor Gillingham: Okay, and I move that By-laws No. 102/2024, 104/2024 and 109/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 102/2024, By-law No. 104/2024 and 109/2024.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, I would move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 102/2024, 104/2024, and 109/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move into question period for the Mayor. Councillor Mayes.

EXECUTIVE POLICY COMMITTEE
QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Free Press had a piece on Saturday that had a headline along the lines of everything is negative. But in that piece, there was a quote from the Mayor where the Mayor said that...Gillingham said the City is spending a record of 138 million on road construction this year. 138 million record. This contrasts poorly with the statement from the 2022 budget over the Mayor's signature and with former Mayor Bowman. In 2022, we were investing a record 164.7 million into local and regional road renewal. So, we had a record 165 million, we are now at a record 138 million. This is a bit hard to follow, so I am going to ask the Mayor. I assume the answer will be well that is what the City is putting in it. It is a record high from the City. But aren't we better than that? Why don't we just give a straight answer as to what the total amount is. Why would we say a record, now, of 138? Maybe that is our contribution, and the other levels of government have bailed out. Why don't we just say that instead of claiming we had a record 165 and now we have a record 138?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Through you Madam Speaker, I would like to thank the Councillor for the question. He will note that the line is not in quotations because what I said was that we have been spending record amounts of road...record amounts of road budgets. I never gave a figure of 138 because, in fact, that is not a record. Certainly, if we look at our budgets over the last year, as a Council will know, we had a great regional program that was funded by the federal provincial governments which gave us larger budgets in previous years. We dipped this year, I think in fact it is 141.5 million dollars, I think, is the 2024 budget, projected to go back up again in future years. But I have said consistently that over...that we have been doing record roads budgets in the last several years. I believe my comment was that, that we are doing record road budgets and that was...I will consistently say that. It dips a bit, it goes up. But if you compare it to the last several years, you know, a decade ago, we are on record pace and set to climb again.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes, second question.

Councillor Mayes: Pleased to hear that. I mean the actual quote in the paper is said, the City is spending a record 138 million, so I am pleased to hear the Mayor say that that is not accurate because I think we should be consistent and straightforward with the public and whether we are using our money...

Madam Speaker: ...Question, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: ...or the overall money. Well, I guess the question would be, so when we get to 2027, are we going to say it is a record 30 percent reduction in the roads budget? Because that is...our share is going down 30 percent. Or are we going to say it is a record 170 million because we are including in the other levels of government? I would prefer to say the latter. I do not know why we would start quoting our share in lieu of the overall number. It gets confusing if you are saying, we are spending 22 million less and that is a record. But to be fair to the Mayor, he is saying that is not exactly what he said.

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Yes, thank you. Obviously future budgets are yet to come. And if they are indeed a combined record budget as we increase, you know, we will be saying that again. So, I thank the Councillor for the opportunity to clarify that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker, it was explained to me that the Mayor was on the radio and somebody...they were talking about garbage bins overflowing and having people from around the area dumping into the bins that they do not own. And do not live in that particular property. And it was mentioned that, well, just lock the bin. And you won't have that abuse happen. Well Madam Speaker, I am just wondering if the Mayor knows that we have a number of businesses, like Luda's restaurant on Salter Street where she keeps it locked at all times and what happens Madam Speaker, is people still dump their chesterfields, bags and bags of garbage. Even though it is locked, they are dumping it beside it. And you know what happens, Madam Speaker? So, you want to make a recommendation, you should understand what is really happening out there, Madam Speaker. So I was just wondering if the Mayor's aware that those bins, even if they are locked, get abused and then, the carrier who is supposed to come and collect it and take that bin away, or empty the garbage, won't do it because there is needles, couches, bags of garbage all around it. So I am just wondering if the Mayor is aware, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I want to thank the Councillor for his question. And no doubt, that Councillor Eadie has talked about bulky waste issues in his ward and other areas among other things for a long time. I have said consistently where we can reduce the ability for individuals to tamper with...

Madam Speaker: Please. We have a speaker on the floor.

Mayor Gillingham: Where we can reduce the possibility for individuals to tamper with garbage receptacles, and pull the contents out and, you know, they end up all over the street. We should do that. We are taking...from several different fronts, we have been making efforts to try to reduce the amount of garbage that is around our community. Whether it is bulky waste or drinking cups or whatever could come out of a small receptacle. Where we...if we can lock up garbage cans in certain areas, and that can help reduce that debris everywhere, I am in favour of that. If we can get different garbage containers that cannot be tampered with, I am in favour of that. But I do acknowledge locking garbage cans is not the answer to everything. Councillor Eadie is right. I can absolutely appreciate where you have got bins sometimes that have locks on them. That does not stop individuals just from coming and dumping stuff beside the bin. So, I would not say that locking garbage cans is the panacea to all things, the challenges we are facing. We are just trying to find ways, though, to reduce the amount of litter in our community. I do believe the receptacles that are along Main Street, Portage Avenue and other places where they can be locked or secured or make it impossible or very difficult for people to tamper with them. That, I think that should be done. And so, but I appreciate the Councillor's question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. We, like other jurisdictions through Canada, North America, and yes, many parts of the world, are dealing with budget challenges. Of course, you cannot solve a problem you cannot explain. It is pretty hard to do. Because we are in the business of talking together in order to make decisions. Explaining things to the public so they can vote on these things. In the last year or two His Worship, our Mayor, has said in this chamber that the reasons...primary reasons for our budget increases are due to COVID, labour costs, and other factors. And I thought that was an unusual way to put it. A way I would not put it because it is not very precise. And to say labour costs, well, I mean, how labour costs in terms of wage earners, that proportion of our inflation at City Hall is kind of minimal. In fact, in some sectors labour costs are a smaller and smaller part of the budget. But I was thinking in terms of wages. It is really kind of on me, not just me, but on me, and I admit...Should have figured this out earlier. It really just occurred to me this summer, that if you...when you say labour costs, it does make sense, it could make sense. It might make sense if you are talking about including salaries. And I was not thinking about that. So I am asking His Worship, when he said labour costs, was he also including salaries not just wages?

Madam Speaker: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: I thank the...I thank the Councillor for the question. Generally, if...and I do not know the specifics of, you know, when it was. Generally, if I am talking labour costs, in my mind, labour costs include everything, salaries, wages, benefits, pension contributions, and the like.

Madam Speaker: Okay. No further questions? Councillor Mayes, yes, second round.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you, Madam Speaker. To the Mayor's credit, when he was Finance Chair, he resisted the urge to spend the revenue from the impact fee, despite pressure from many others. And that proved out to be, frankly a godsend for the City when we lost a litigation and had not spent the money and still had and had been accumulating interest. This contrasts poorly, I would say, with the decision in the most recent budget to book the revenue from a 911 fee that does not yet exist. So we have, frankly, a problem. We have a problem that is on the backs of the taxpayers, which is we expect a revenue. We budgeted for revenue. The revenue is not there. It is hard to get the exact number out of the last budget, but it is certainly a dollar a line starting...roughly \$300,000 a month, I would suggest, starting July 1st. Can the Mayor clarify, something went wrong here? Was there a written agreement with the Province? Did his office misinterpret what the Province was saying? What has happened here? Has the Province reneged? Because we have a problem that is getting worse and worse in the budget which is we booked revenue from a 911 fee of revenue we are not getting.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Mayor Gillingham: I want to thank the Councillor for the question, Madam Speaker. Yes. The intention (inaudible) the budget was passed, was that these funds, the revenues, would already started to be collected by now. They have not.

We are actively working with our staff. I think we are much closer with our staff on that. And also, act in...in discussions with the Province of Manitoba as far as the timing of that. So, this is a matter we are working on right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Right to the question.

Councillor Mayes: Someone has made a multi-million-dollar mistake. Can the Mayor release any correspondence that was had with the Province? I was not on the budget working group, nor was Councillor Rollins, so I do not know what might have been discussed there. But you were, Madam Speaker. So, was the idea that the Province had agreed to this? Has the Mayor staff misinterpreted? Did someone from the Province renege? Could we have...if there is anything in writing on this, can we have that released so the public can see what went wrong here?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Gillingham: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not know that anything went wrong. It is just a matter of timing and so, I would be glad to, you know, provide any information that could assist the Councillor.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. That is no further questions, I see. Let's move on to the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development. We have many items before us. Councillor Rollins.

**REPORT OF THE
 STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
 DATED SEPTEMBER 13, 2024**

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I am going to ask for your help because I believe some items are going to need to be stood down. Otherwise, I will move the majority of Items 1 to 16, with thanks. So, I think there is a few here that are going to be stood down...

Madam Speaker: ...We will stand down 4, there is an amending motion. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: 15, please.

Madam Speaker: Okay, just one moment. 15 is Subdivision and Rezoning of Lemay. Next, Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: 5 and 6, please. 5 is the Procedure By-law...

Madam Speaker: ...5 is the Procedure By-law's amendments. And 6, you mentioned? City-wide residential infill strategy. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: 2 and 16.

Madam Speaker: 2 is Extension of Time – Elmhurst Road. 16 is...16, yes, there is an amending motion. The real estate policy framework. And that is it. Okay. I will call the question. 4 is (inaudible). That is right. Okay, Councillor Rollins, thank you. With that, I will call the question on 1 and 3, 7, 8, 9, 10 through 14. Thank you. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. The first item is Item 2.

Item 2 – Extension of Time – Plan of Subdivision and Rezoning – 398 Elmhurst Road – DASZ 17/2022

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: I rise on a financial conflict and step out of the room.

Madam Speaker: Pecuniary conflict of interest. Yes, thank you. I will have you depart the chamber momentarily. Thank you. Councillor Rollins, on Item 2.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. So moved.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Any further speakers? I will call the question. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Get ready for the next item. Madam Clerk.

**Item 4 – Concurrence of Prioritized List of Issues with Recent Legislative Changes to
the City of Winnipeg Charter Act**

Madam Speaker: And there is an amending...amending motion going with this item. Motion 11, we are withdrawing. Councillor Orlikow is not here, so we will not be dealing with it. There is a new motion, Motion 13; moved by Councillor Eadie, seconded by Councillor Gillingham...Mayor Gillingham, with respect to the Municipal Board. And that is in order. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I am just going to briefly introduce this. I think the...Mr. Mayor, actually, Madam Speaker, introduced components of what has changed, earlier this morning, if you will recall. In essence what you have here is an appendix of issues and they are in a variety of themes that this Council knows very well stemming from Bills 37 and 34 that came into affect October 29th, 2021, and September 1, 2023, respectively, and both pieces of legislation make changes to the City of Winnipeg's Charter and require the Province to undertake a review in consultation with the City. And to that end, I, as well as the Department, have been consulting on issues, around five issues: The Municipal Board, terminology like 'refused and rejected', development plans, unproclaimed sections of the Act, inconsistencies and general clean ups. That, you know, is the fodder of a legislative review, especially one that is so critical to enabling our economy. So, what you have here is the thick of it, Madam Speaker. I am very interested in the City of Winnipeg Charter Act. I am very interested in our Planning Act. And I am very interested in the met region and the economic development priorities. I have said a lot in this chamber about the Municipal Board, and I will say that I am amenable to the amendments and will open that way, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Mr. Mayor...or Councillor Eadie your opportunity to speak to the amending motion.

Motion No. 11

Moved by Councillor Orlikow,

Seconded by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,

WHEREAS on May 29, 2020 Council requested that the Province provide local residents impacted by a decision, in addition to property owners, with the right of appeal to the Municipal Board on municipal land use decisions;

AND WHEREAS to date, there have only been two referrals to the Municipal Board for applications which received a sufficient amount of objections, which had no impact on housing affordability in Winnipeg.

AND WHEREAS there is no evidence that the impact of the present requirement by the Municipal Board affects affordability;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated September 13, 2024 be amended as follows:

- *In Recommendation 1, delete the period after the words "Bills 37 and 34 and replace with the following:*

“, with the following amendments:

- A. *Amend Issue ID “E” by deleting “500” and replacing with “150”*

Motion No. 13

Moved by Councillor Eadie,

Seconded by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,

WHEREAS on May 29, 2020 Council requested that the Province provide local residents impacted by a decision, in addition to property owners, with the right of appeal to the Municipal Board on municipal land use decisions;

AND WHEREAS to date, there have only been two referrals to the Municipal Board for applications which received a sufficient amount of objections, which had no impact on housing affordability in Winnipeg.

AND WHEREAS there is no evidence that the impact of the present requirement by the Municipal Board affects affordability;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 4 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated September 13, 2024 be amended as follows:

- *In Recommendation 1, delete the period after the words “Bills 37 and 34 and replace with the following:*

“, with the following amendments:

A. *Amend Issue ID “E” by deleting “500” and replacing with “150”*

Councillor Eadie: Yes, Madam Speaker. John and I have spent a lot of time...Councillor Orlikow and I have spent a lot of time. Ultimately, having to get 500 citizens who are opposed to a development that is going to...to go to the Municipal Board to go against it, is totally antidemocratic. Like, really? 500 people? There has only been a couple that have gone to the Municipal Board from the citizens who are opposed to development in the area. And...and that required 100 people. Like, the area that that happened, you know, maybe it is easier for people to organize there and stuff like that. But I mean, it is really far and few between. 100 people in opposition to be able to go to the Municipal Board. But now, to say 500, Madam Speaker...500? Wow. Like, Madam Speaker, it is just...that is totally not right to the public. Yes, we want to help developers develop. I...you know, Madam Speaker, you know of myself. I support many development agreements. And actually, one of those ones that had 100 and...100 citizens go to the Municipal Board, I was actually in favour of what the community committee and then P and D and then Council ended up voting on. And it was shut down. That is fine. But I thought it was a...I thought it was a great project from the developer. I did not...I did not understand the aspects. But...so ultimately, there has been a number of problems as the Chairperson has pointed out, Madam Speaker. But so, this would amend it so that we are...it is recommending 150. So, it is adding 50 more. Which, in a sense, in itself is like, if there is only been two...anyway, but this is what Councillor Orlikow has worked on and he knows what he is doing. And so, it is so moved.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: I am troubled by some of the comments. I am troubled by the document as a whole. I am troubled in this sense; this is sort of the mirror image of what the staff proposed some years ago as a response to when the Municipal Board was created. The 500 should look familiar because that was the...going to be the Winnipeg suggestion for the threshold for public objectors. My reading is the current standard is 25, not 100, but perhaps someone can change that. Thanks. So, the package...I support the amendment. The amendment is better than having the 500. So, kudos to Orlikow and Eadie for coming up with that. It is still a much higher threshold than the current 25. But what this package does is kind of flip on its head the objection we had earlier. The original draft of the provincial legislation was developers can appeal. Not so much land...not so much neighbours or residents. We objected to that. The staff then said, well, okay, but it will be 500 in order for the citizenry to get there. So, that got changed, luckily, down to 25. We are saying 150. Well, we are also saying, in the very first provision, no appeals by landowners or applicants. So, I am not sure how that is going to promote building or densification or any of the goals we have been talking about. So, this actually takes what was originally proposed by the conservatives and completely inverts it, which is only the residents can get there, not the applicants, not the landowners. If indeed the Province listens to this whole submission. And I actually would disagree with that and I would disagree with the phrase, well, we do not want an unelected body telling us what to do. I think there is a serious problem to stand here and say, yes, we do not want that other level of government meddling in our planning decisions just after we have said, yes, but it is okay for the Federal Government to put certain requirements on us like fourplexes everywhere and a very specific height limit and a very specific distance limit from a very specific determination of what frequent transit is. All of that is okay because we are getting some money. Some Churchillian quotes about, you know, once you get money what that makes you. But I got to say, I find it incredibly incongruous that we are very upset that the provincial level might have some say in our zoning decision, but we are okay with the Federal Government doing that, as long as we get some money for it. So, the HAF program has given out some commendable grants. Some today, some for affordable housing. But the idea that somehow there are no...there are no...there is no control, there is no input on our local democratic decision making is just complete falsehood. So, I will vote for the amendment. I do not think I will vote for the overall package. I actually, dare we say it, tend to agree with Mr. Wintrup's editorial recently published that said, well, there is still a role for provincial oversight because, frankly, it brings a level of consistency. You have heard me go on about some of the decisions we have made here recently, and you will probably hear me later on in this agenda. Things like the property on Grosvenor was one that was recently overturned by the Municipal Board. One of the ones I put in was overturned by the Municipal Board on a gravel lane requirement. Other decisions have been overturned by the Municipal Board. Frankly, I...maybe that is just politics. Maybe that is just if you have enough votes, you can get through for your ward what you want and other wards, well, not so lucky. But one cannot blame the Province for saying, shouldn't we have some measure of consistency here across the field. So, frankly, I think if the Province agrees to our suggestions here, I would certainly expect the development community to question why we are propounding only the residents can appeal now and none of the people who want to actually build. So, kudos to Councillor Eadie, to Councillor Orlikow, for spotting the problem with the suggested return from our staff that we would actually have a 500-person threshold, which I think is completely undemocratic. So, the Municipal Board, we do not always agree with it. They overturned one of my decisions. That is...that is okay. But I also do not think we should claim that we are upset with another level of government having some role in our planning

decisions when we have made the vote around, and we will doing a very intense exercise on, what do you mean by fourplex? What do you mean by the height limit? What do you mean by 800 metres? That is pretty much micro-managing from the federal level, as I see it. But that is not the vote today, the vote today is on this. So, yes to the amendment, but I will not be supporting the overall package.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Eadie do you wish to close?

Councillor Eadie: I am just going to close.

Madam Speaker: On the amending motion.

Councillor Eadie: Yes, on the amendment. I am just going to close on the amendment and just say the comments from my colleague, I think, are fair. But yes, in the end, 500 is just ridiculous. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, your opportunity to close.

Councillor Rollins: Yes, and if I may, here is why I think you can support this motion because the review was going to go in. And then, the Province has a year to read it, contemplate change, and make changes to which all legislative changes, we will get another say. So, I think that this is low risk. I appreciate the time and effort, though, in reviewing. We all care about it. We might hold different opinion but, you know, I definitely care about Bill 37 and 34. And while I want our enabling legislation to provide certainty for the City of Winnipeg, and as every member of Council knows, Madam Speaker, patience is not my virtue, I think that there is more to come with respect to the Provincial Government, their priorities for this legislation, after they have contemplated a review by the consultants. And so, more to come on this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question on amending Motion 13. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the main Item 4, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Noted Councillor Mayes in opposition and Councillor Orlikow absent. Madam Clerk.

Item 5 – Development Procedures By-Law Amendments

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins to introduce the item.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, in some respects, Madam Speaker, this is a bit of notes for you. Property and Development considered Council's direction on Council being the hearing body for the Housing Accelerator Fund. And to that end, we, you know, considered the...a few amendments. And one of the amendments that I will point out, and I will listen for...you know, I will turn it back over to Council colleagues that pulled it back...pulled it down. But one of...one of the...one of the things we talked about when all 16 members are in the chamber and you are in the speaker chair and chairing the meetings, Madam Speaker, is just...you know, that perhaps we could shorten the amount of time that we speak to five minutes. We considered that, you know, we have a lot of experience doing hearings. Not necessarily together, but apart, within our community committees and certainly within various Standing Policy Committees that hold hearings. And that we would do just like we do except all together. And so, this motion comes for Council's consideration that provides some contours when Council is designated as the hearing body in respect to public hearing or combined hearing. And that we should follow the established practices and procedures that we follow from every hearing. Just like much of the work that we did this month at Property and Development. And where...where Council is designated hearing body in respect to a public hearing or combined hearing, like many other jurisdictions, whether it is in Canada or around North America, as the Mayor found out at the Big City Mayors...sorry, not the Big City Mayors, also probably there but at Bloomberg Harvard, that really shortens public speaks...speaking opposite in a hearing to under three minutes, Madam Speaker, that we could be assured that five minutes was still very generous. So, I will open it that way. I am very excited about this prospect of Council designating a hearing body. In this case, designating ourselves. And I will open that way, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Chair. Any further speakers? Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: I stood it down, yes.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I stood it down. I am actually...I am impressed. I am totally in favour of...well, it was amended, I think, at EPC a little bit, but...to add in the five minutes. I was listening to EPC while it was happening, Madam Speaker. The thing that troubled me, Madam Speaker, as you know in the last Council meeting

which was like ten weeks ago, I had a concern about another host of zoning changes that were done that, I believed, under the motion we passed under the HAF should have been considered by all of Council. And in that meeting, there was dialogue and it totally demonstrated, Madam Speaker, how having one committee deal with the hearings and that sort of thing, and when it is related to zoning and that stuff, really cannot say nothing. EPC is allowed to change it, whatever, Madam Speaker. But ultimately, I thought there was something unreasonable in that one. And it was demonstrated by another colleague, besides the Chairperson, as to why I felt that it was illegal, Madam Speaker. It should have been heard by all of Council where each member of Council then has an opportunity to propose an amendment without having to go back to another hearing and you can explain all the nuance and ask the administration a question, for example, because when we are in a hearing, we are allowed to talk to the administration. I could have pointed out that there was a concern by a colleague. But there are other rules that pertain to river lots, especially in flood zones and...which would prevent certain things from happening anyway. So, Madam Speaker, anyway, I appreciate that this is being done for our next two rounds of zoning changes related to the Housing Accelerator Fund. And I just wanted to say, the five minutes, I think that is pretty good because I think all of our experiences being, we ask...we ask please, you know, maybe not repeat several times the points are made, right. But with five minutes, that gives the public a chance to present their concern. Maybe not all their concerns but it does give them a chance to present some concerns. And the thing is, there are questions, Madam Speaker. And in a hearing with all of Council with you in the Chair, you know, you respect that if a member of Council while hearing has a question, you get to ask the question, right? So, I think that this is going to work really well. And what...another thing I found amusing was, it only required an amendment of the Development Procedures By-law, Madam Speaker. It did not require any Charter changes. It did not require any changes to the Procedures By-law or Organization By-law or anything like that. Just simple amendments here to the development procedure. So, anyway, I thank the Chairperson for shepherding it through and actually, adding in the five minutes because, actually, in some sense it is a bit abusive on the members of Council if you get 100 people wanting to speak for ten minutes. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Like Councillor Eadie, I am...I am impressed by it in two senses. The provision that talks about the...if the same matter is coming back again within a year. That is a good control. Thank you to whoever drafted that. I think that is the Clerks. So, thank you for that. And I am hoping Councillor Rollins can clarify the phrasing Council's the hearing body for certain matters under the HAF. My understanding is A) there would be a hearing around the malls and corridors, probably before Christmas. And B) there would be a separate public hearing, Council again, on the fourplex stuff, as I like to put it; The fourplexes, the 800 metres, that provision. So, that is...I am not sure one can get that immediately from the text that is in front of us, but I think we are all on the same page on that. That without getting into the buckets, we go...we will go at least twice on this, maybe a third time. But we will go at least once on malls and corridors and then a separate joy-filled public hearing of some hours on the fourplex provision. And I am paraphrasing here somewhat.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Okay. Seeing none, Councillor Rollins, our Chair, to close.

Councillor Rollins: So, really appreciate the words from Deputy Speaker Eadie and Madam Chair, your supportive eye contact. I do feel a bit that Property and Development was, you know, trying to aim for those compliments today, Madam Speaker. It was delicate work that I will credit Carlos and the team at Clerks, too, that came in Property and Development to really contemplate this. You know, exciting day all around for Property and Development. But, in particular, the implementation process that, you know, you know, Madam Speaker, I have been sort of very clear at Council that we are taking three big bites of an apple. And I want to keep going on pace doing what we intend to do, frankly, to the end of the term. And yes, the next step in November is anticipated. Our first public hearing as a Council body on malls and corridors. And then, we go into some open houses where the highly anticipated next steps in the implementation process are public hearings coming up in March 2025, depending, right? Depending if we are on time and, you know, working away at the engagement processes and to consider the four units and up to four stories on residential lots. And then, of course, we will see right through to next term with the 2026 rewrite of the Zoning By-laws. So definitely, you know, you want to stay tuned for that. But I can clarify that big moment this, little motion, pretty subtle. But a lot of work was put in it and credit goes to, always, the great Department of Property and Development led by Hazel Borys. But in this case, the firm guidance of Clerks, Madam Speaker, who you spend a great deal of time with. So...

Madam Speaker: ...We have discussed this.

Councillor Rollins: Great. I hope it is unanimous because it really matters when we are all a hearing body.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question on Item 5. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Councillor Eadie, Deputy Speaker, will you move the motion that we can work past 6:00 p.m.

Councillor Eadie: I will move to work past 6:00 p.m.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. I think we are going to now recess for about 20 minutes.

Councillor Eadie: Right now, or? Six is good to go past.

Madam Speaker: We could finish six, sure.

Councillor Eadie: Six will go fast.

Madam Speaker: Okay, Madam Clerk.

Item 6 – City-Wide Residential Infill Strategy

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I referenced this just a minute ago in terms of staying the course, so I will turn it over to those that...perhaps Councillor Dobson who originally moved the motion with Councillor Orlikow. But I believe Councillor Eadie may have stood it down.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, well, Madam Speaker, this motion was actually pretty complex, and I am not sure if some other colleagues besides Dobson are going to speak to this. But I stood this down, Madam Speaker, for one reason: infill strategy. Now, we have our whole infill, like, areas, lower density, higher density and all that kind of stuff. And we talk about a strategy, Madam Speaker, but at our last Council meeting there was a motion that was referred back to EPC and it did not show up, though. It was moved by Councillor Gilroy and moved by...seconded by Councillor Eadie, related to having...trying to get a...we were calling it something different, but something like a core area initiative to deal with outside...all around the outside of downtown in neighbourhoods like William Whyte, Dufferin. We need to revitalize those neighbourhoods. We need...there is a lot of things that need to do and we need all levels of government to work on it. Now, an infill strategy, Madam Speaker, could be designed and focused in, and under our Complete Communities we have those areas that are defined in terms of what level of infill and all that kind of thing. Now, Madam Speaker, what could happen with the strategy, this could be part of that tri-level agreement. And you have an infill strategy that looks at not only trying to...because what did...I am trying to remember the last number, but William Whyte neighbourhood, for example, it was 180 vacant derelict houses. Or was it...I mean, there is 500 or 800 or whatever in the city. It seems to be growing. They are burning down. Some are getting ripped down. Our administration this year is...a couple...a few interesting ones that have been happening in my ward. And I really appreciate that, Madam Speaker. But there is a lot of empty lots now, Madam Speaker. And they are going to sit there because we need a strategy for infill where there is ownership and rental. Where these lots that will sit empty and people will speculate but nobody wants to build. We could have a strategy that looks at these neighbourhoods because they are all there. I think Spence neighbourhood might be one. Why, even, maybe to some degree the Chalmers neighbourhood. So, Chalmers, maybe, Madam Speaker? Anyway, so I just wanted to point out, while I am going to be voting for this, it was received as information. I know it is a very, really, controversial proposal that Councillor Orlikow and Dobson moved forward. But I just wanted to point out to my colleagues that, you know, there are some things that we need and there is a bunch of pieces, Madam Speaker, that we are doing already that could go into what I call neighbourhood revitalization. And then, there is other levels of things; the Minister of Housing and Addiction is doing a number of things. What we need to do, Madam Speaker, is bring a bunch of people together, look at what is being done, where do we target focus. We know that that is happening in downtown right now, Madam Speaker. That is definitely happening now in downtown. And I love the eleven HAF projects. Some of those are...those are...I think they are all infill projects. Well, except for that one building. Anyway, these are...they are like infill projects, right? So, this is...this is what is happening for downtown. I was a little disappointed. I know there was some applications, there is some really bad properties that need to be gone in my ward on Main Street just outside of downtown. Just outside of downtown. And I was sad that one of those proposals did not make it. Oh well. I do not know for what reason or whatever, Madam Speaker, but I just want to point out, an infill strategy rather than...you know, we had the Complete Communities. We focused, we say what we want to do there, whatever. The Downtown Zoning By-law has its thing. And...but a strategy is, where do we have the biggest problem? Let's try to target it and resolve it through doing or promoting ownership infill, as well as, rental infill. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker, Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Thank you. Yes, I agree with receiving this information as moved at EPC. It was a conscious decision made by Council, at least those of us who voted for the infill guidelines, which was shepherded through by

Councillor Gilroy, to her credit, back in 2021, that those applied only to certain areas of the city, the mature communities. It was a fair bit of time spent on defining what did we really mean by mature community. And a lot of work done to try and make sure that was applied equally in different neighbourhoods. You cannot really call them the infill guidelines anymore; they are infill rules now, we will have to get used to that as of, I think two meetings ago of Council. I voted for that, as well. The idea that, hey, let's just spread this across the city I do not think is appropriate. The idea was to try and encourage infill in some of the older neighbourhoods. Obviously, it is controversial. The blanket terms that get thrown around, oh, it is all failed housing. And we are...houses past their useful lifespan. I do not know, I have been to Councillor Rollins' house, it is older than mine. I do not think it is past its useless lifespan. It is a very nice house. Good for her. You go down...you go down Wellington Crescent or go down Kingston Crescent; those are older homes. Some of them are 100 years old. They are not past their useful lifespan; they are not failed housing. So, one can get into the details, but the larger point here is...was made, actually, by Appeals Committee yesterday, to the credit of Appeals Committee. There was a hearing with somebody trying to take the infill rules and move them across into the mature community neighbourhood, saying, well, just over here you have been doing this. Yes, that is what line drawing is. There are two sides of a line. So, to the credit of Councillors Dobson, Allard, Rollins and Duncan, they sided with the administration and with the residents who said, no, we should not be bringing in a different set of rules, arbitrarily allowing some of this in some wards and not in others. So, that is the framework we consciously decided to make. We are going to have to have a debate. The infill rules, to the credit of some of the staff who worked on that; Kostiuik, Mai and others, was...were just going to leave the fourplex concept alone. That is going to be dealt with by Council later. But we have got pretty clear rules now on triplexes, duplexes, some of what was envisaged in the original infill guidelines. So, I support what EPC said here, let's leave that alone. We are going to have a debate in...within a year about what do we want to do with this whole idea of fourplexes. But I want to commend Appeals Committee the other day for being consistent and saying yes, it is...you know, people can get up there and claim they are going to solve the housing crisis but there are a set of rules. These people were not complying with the rules so Appeals Committee said, no, we are going to follow the staff and the residents. I think that was the right call to make. And reflecting that, yes, I think we should just receive this motion as information.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Seeing no further speakers, Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. You know, I do want to be really direct with Council about the work plan and where it is and where it is not and the priorities. And I really appreciate the motion. And I really appreciate, you know...and I think it is really important to say on the record, the housing challenges that all wards have in various different ways from Mynarski to Point Douglas to Daniel McIntyre. There is not a community committee that goes by that Councillor Orlikow and I do not have a development in our wards, but there are many months that go by where Councillor Gilroy does not. And that is really critical. And it is critical to have an...kind of an equity lens on that to consider what we are doing together for each other to build a stronger city. And certainly, if I did not believe that the work that we had before us was going to get us there, then, you know, I would, obviously, probably take a different position opposite this as a priority. I obviously only have residential infill in my ward. I think that is obvious. I have...I have no other types of development. And so, but I do think we are on the right path to building a stronger city together. I do think we have a lot of the right ingredients. And I do have a meeting with Minister Smith really soon. And guess what constituency is shared between Daniel Mac and Mynarski and, you know, a bit of...sorry, Point Douglas is Minister Smith. So, I think it is really critical that we are listening to each other, our priorities, and I think we will...we are...we are very much on a successful path. I truly believe that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, I will call the question on Item 6. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. There are two more items under this committee and then on to Water and Waste. I think it was the will of Council to take a recess right now for about 20-25 minutes. Okay. Then we will reconvene at about 6:20, 6:30. Thank you.

**Reconvened meeting of
Winnipeg City Council of
September 26, 2024, at 6:37 p.m.**

Madam Speaker: I would like to reconvene our Council meeting of September 26th, 2024. We are on the Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development, Item 15. We do have...Councillor Chambers, go ahead.

Councillor Chambers: Yes, I will be recusing myself on an apprehension of bias, or perceived apprehension of bias.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Madam Clerk.

**Item 15 – Subdivision and Rezoning – 823 Lemay Avenue and Land Located Between
35 de la Digue Avenue and 100 Villa Maria Place – DASZ 9/2024**

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Our Chair, Councillor Rollins, to introduce the item, six...15.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Standing Policy Committee of Property and Development concurred in the recommendation of Riel Community Committee, Madam Speaker and EPC also concurred in the recommendation of the Standing Policy Committee on P and D. And that is how it gets to Council.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. With that, any other speakers on this item? Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Excuse me. Admirable brevity from Councillor Rollins there. A few words in praise of Councillor Chambers who is conflicted himself out on this one. He and I had a good talk about this, more generally. Not this file, but just where we are on housing in general, and I think we cleared the air a bit. This file, for those who have read it, applicant wanted 5,000 units. Very good City report from the planners, recommend 800 units, completely proportional to what they have recommended in areas like my ward. If you can put four units on 5,000 square feet, the math's pretty easy on what you can do on a million, which is what this is, it is 800. It is exactly proportional. So, actually, to Dan Iskierski and some others, I thought that was actually a pretty measured report. That said, at the public hearing, for a couple of different reasons, the...Councillor Allard and I did not support the application. It has rolled through without a whimper after that. So, why did I pull it, then? Two reasons. It is almost certainly moot anyway. The applicant's gone to the Municipal Board due to our failure to hear this in August. The City countered that...no, there is a different element to this and as long as we make a final decision by September 24th or 25th, it is all fine. Well, obviously, that has not been done, we are here today. So, it is almost certainly all moot anyway and it will be thrashed out at the Municipal Board. Perhaps these comments, if Hansard is legible, can be used in one way or the other there. But back to Councillor Chambers; he and I talked about housing in general. And I guess what we came up with was, you know, there are those who have said well, you are either a visionary or an exclusionary. Or there is those who have said, oh...I think it was the Federal Government who said, well, we voted to legalize housing. For clarity, housing was actually never illegal in anywhere where we have voted to move forward. And it is not on this file, but the vote on the HAF did not actually legalize housing, and if you actually want to get into inflammatory rhetoric that is wildly inaccurate, I suppose you can. But I think Chambers and I actually had a pretty good discussion in which he said, look, I think there are exceptions in your ward, I think there are exceptions in my ward. So, we talk about a crisis and we do need more housing. And I think the work along the malls and the corridors will help with that. But what I think we need to be wary of is the kind of shaming and the kind of blaming and the kind of demonizing that sometimes occurs around here when people come forward and object in their neighbourhoods to oppose development. And people are told that they are in favour of climate change or they are insensitive to the needs of the poor or they are insensitive to the needs of young couples who need housing or they are indifferent to any number of other things. So, if we really believe that, that it is a crisis and by god we have to do everything we humanly can to develop within our means, well then, why didn't somebody pull this earlier? Why didn't somebody say, hey, this is 800 units, they are all within 800 metres of frequent transit. I do not think that is even debatable because frequent transit runs down Pembina down into St. Norbert. But surely, it is a little more complicated than that down there at the Lemay Forest, and I think Councillor Chambers would want me to say that. That surely, if there exceptions in his ward, and this appears to be one of them, where we are not saying, well, it is a crisis and therefore, let's do 800 or 5,000 units. We are saying quite the contrary. No, we are listening to the residents, we have concerns about the loss of the trees. If that constitutes a de facto expropriation, I guess the Municipal Board will make that call or the courts will. But that is not my point. My point is to say, I was glad that we cleared the air, Councillor Chambers and I, to say, it isn't as simple as someone's an exclusionary and someone's a visionary if they voted for the HAF. It is rather more complicated than that. It is rather more complicated in that, obviously, we are making an exception here in this ward saying, no, we are not just going to go with the developer, we are not going to put 800 units in. Damn the residents and their concerns, they are all NIMBYs. We are not saying that. So, all I would ask is, well, let's use that same discretion, that same consideration, that same balancing when we look at issues in some other wards. We all have our concerns. I will talk about gravel lanes sometimes. I will talk about how there certainly should be a reasonable lot size minimum for fourplexes. That is in the motion we just saw from last November. And what exactly that will be, I guess we will have to sort that out next year. But I would just say, perhaps a cooling of the rhetoric, and I think Councillor Chambers and I accomplished that, to his credit, and I think to mine, to say, look, there are exceptions. It is not as easy as one is an exclusionary or a visionary or oh, you did not vote for this, you do not want housing to be legal. It is more complicated, and this is an example of that. So, when we get to those debates, those public hearings that Councillor Rollins was talking about a few minutes ago, just bear that in mind. If you are voting today to not to proceed with 800 units or 5,000 units of housing, then please, let's not tell people who show up and also have concerns about their communities and their neighbourhoods, let's not shame them. Let's not blame them for...let's not say they are in favour of perpetuating a crisis. Let's try and find a balance. The Mayor ran on the Council...on the corridors and malls and that is fair. That was always part of the HAF or part of this SPAP, but really, this idea of fourplexes everywhere, and then the staff say, did you mean up to fourplexes? No, the federally imposed requirement was fourplexes everywhere.

Okay. Do we really mean everywhere? No. Even the motion says, well, on paved roads and lanes and with a certain lot size minimum. So, we will have to haggle all that out. But...so I come not to bury Councillor Chambers here but to praise him and to say, look, we seem to have...this is an important precedent, important model here. We are listening to the community. We are not going to simply blindly go ahead and ignore the residents and their concerns. We are going to take a breath and say, well, even with our concerns about housing, there are exceptions. So, on that, I think I have spanned a line with Councillor Chambers. There are going to be exceptions in his ward. There are going to be exceptions in my ward. Probably going to be exceptions in every ward. How do we work out the details? Well, I guess we will sort that out at the public hearing, but I would just ask for some...some of the same consideration for people in Councillor Orlikow's ward, my ward, Dobson's ward, other...other wards that is being afforded to the people here. We will see what happens at the Municipal Board, but for today at least, let's note, none of us are rushing to change the recommendations of EPC. None of us are rushing to say, 800 units, 8...within 800 metres of transit, by god, let's go with that. So, let's use that same judgment, that same respect for the residents when we come to other matters. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker on this item? Seeing none, Councillor Rollins to close.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you. Appreciate the words from my colleague, Madam Speaker, to engage in, well, an appeal against rhetorical fallacies, Madam Speaker, and misleading reasoning. And I think that that is really fair. To tackle the crisis, we need a comprehensive approach. We certainly do not need rhetorical fallacies and misleading reasoning. And we probably do need a lot more diplomacy and collaboration, some that you will see in real time coming up at the next motion pertaining to amendments to the Real Estate Policy framework in support of affordable housing by colleagues Wyatt and Schreyer, Madam Speaker. What I will say about this is that we had several appeals before committee and each and every one of them, it seemed, that Mr. Wintrup, who is the representative...this developer was advancing before Property and Development, Madam Speaker. And I will say this about Mr. Wintrup, I have known him for quite a few years now, and I really do appreciate, which I told him in advance of him getting ready for an appeal, whether it was this one or another one, that I really appreciate his updates because he supports women and development and is quite proud of developing people. And so, I have that to say about him, and I will focus on, you know, what aligns us and not necessarily what divides us, and I think that that is what we should do today. If you could call the question, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Madam Chair. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Next item, Item 16, Madam Clerk.

Item 16 – Amendments to the Real Estate Policy Framework in Support of Affordable Housing

Madam Speaker: We have the main item, we have Motion 14, the amending motion moved by Councillor Schreyer, seconded by Councillor Wyatt. I understand you would like to withdraw?

Councillor Schreyer: I rescind that motion with support of the seconder.

Motion No. 14

**Moved by Councillor Schreyer,
 Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 16 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated September 13, 2024 be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1.A.ii. 0 Cal Gardiner Drive (roll #04006983100)*
- *Delete Recommendation 1.A.vii. 545-569 Watt Street*
- *Renumber the remaining recommendations accordingly.*

Madam Speaker: Councillor Wyatt, you concur? Okay. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. There is now a new motion that is similar. Amending Motion 15, moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Schreyer that will be considered. It has been...it is being circulated at this moment. Madam Chair.

Councillor Rollins: Thank you, Madam Speaker. Council will recall that we are engaged in a generational change with respect to our Zoning By-laws and with the support of the Housing Accelerator Fund. What we know, too, is that since taking office all of us have been concentrating on housing motions and advancing those. And some of them we started right back in November of 2022. I think the month after we were elected, maybe December, it went through Council on amendments that would provide property, City property, for social housing, affordable housing. And so, here we are, doing what we said we were going to do. And look...and the CAO...And thanks to our team; Marc Pittet, Gord Chappell.

And the CAO was delegated by Council to really declare a City-owned land surplus intended for affordable housing, subject to the circulation requirements in the declaration of surplus and sale of property policy. And then further to, regardless of the value, the City-owned land will be intended to affordable housing and really must remain affordable housing through the life of the agreement. These are key features I think we can be really proud of as a Council when...and I hope it passes unanimously. To that end, it is important to understand, too, that what we will be...we will be doing is we will be delegating to the CAO once more the authority to declare the City-owned properties intended for affordable housing as surplus. And you know what? There is a lot of people interested in this housing. I have been approached sometimes by five or six groups on the same plot of land. And key to that, Madam Speaker, is...and key to drawing down funds, whether they are green build of FCM, whether they are the Housing Accelerator Fund or the Rapid Housing Initiative that we had before it, CMHC as land assembly. So, this is a really key step. If you are interested in affordable housing, and you know that there is a lot of providers out there...We know we got 66 applications and 166 million dollars of requests. This is a really key step. It is really...if you want...if you thought we were one and done with the Housing Accelerator Fund, no. We have more planned and this is that moment. We release this property and it gets exciting from here because there is more to do. So, 825 Taché, Cal Gardner Drive, William Avenue, Pacific Avenue, Osborne, Pembina Highway, Watt Street, Granite Way. Here it is. Now, colleagues have come to...with a amending motion to delete recommendation 1.A, the Cal Gardner Drive property, and then renumber the recommendations accordingly. I am amenable to this, Madam Speaker, and I will tell you why. I think the point today, for me, is to get this property out the door today. Now, there is property that we require. It is zoned, I believe, commercial right now, but we require a two-thirds majority vote here. And I am absolutely willing to let go of this property to get that vote, Madam Speaker. I think it is really important, though, that we get as much out the door today. It is a critical moment. So, I am amenable to this motion, but I hope it is fairly unanimous because I know people...people need us...to see us do this. They need us to be doing more on housing, and this is more.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to speak to the item and your amendment.

Motion No. 15

**Moved by Councillor Wyatt,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,**

BE IT RESOLVED THAT Item 16 of the Report of the Standing Policy Committee on Property and Development dated September 13, 2024 be amended as follows:

- *Delete Recommendation 1.A.ii. 0 Cal Gardiner Drive (roll #04006983100) and renumber the remaining recommendations accordingly (see Appendix A for site plan)*

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, thank you, Madam Speaker. I just want to note that, you know, I move the motion reluctantly. I am very supportive of what Councillor Rollins has indicated. However, when I indicated...And I did respond with the administration back in December of 2023 regarding this property. I indicated to them at the time that there is an active transportation path along the side of this property and that the land should be set aside as our right-of-way. They are calling for an easement instead of an ownership of the right-of-way. I think it is important that an active transportation path be treated no different than a roadway for cars, that bicycles are just as important and physical exercise, whether you are walking or biking, that the right-of-way be secured as City land versus giving it up through the easement. So, actually, I am committed to bringing this property back to what Councillor Rollins was speaking about. Once we have...I chance this...I follow up with the Public Service, namely the Real Estate Department of the City to bring this back so that we have the land set aside as City-owned land. We do not have to have an easement on a private title. And to ensure that that connectivity is this. This is called the flamingo pathway. It connects from the north to the south. It actually connects up to Transcona Boulevard, which is a park city pathway, connecting all the way down to the Transcona trail, and by...into what is called Wilfred...Sir Wilfred Laurier Park. Furthermore, to complicate this site of which is...The map, you can see the attachment, it shows Cal Gardner Drive as one access to the property. Steve Mymko Drive as one access. Believe it or not, if you look at i-view or if you look at Google Maps, Cal Gardner Drive does not exist. It is not installed. And the developer in question, Genstar, in this neighbourhood, this is considered Devonshire Village, did not build out Cal Gardner from Prymak Place through to the property line because they did not need to. They built a multiple family housing project on the north side of Cal Gardner, so the land is actually land locked. Steve Mymko, as well, does not exist. This turns up basically onto Larry Vickar Drive, and there is a section...So, there is basically about 100 feet on one section that is maybe...maybe 110 feet where a road stops and advances. Further down it is probably about 300 feet, in terms of the actual address, the main road accessing the site, being Cal Gardner Drive. Which means that it would drive up the cost in terms of affordable housing. However, the Councillor and I are both on the Winnipeg Housing Board of Directors and we have worked with Winnipeg Housing to find a way to get property earmarked, and they find a way to make it work with their applications to different government authorities to help cover those types of costs. Furthermore, the entire site is a concrete parking lot, not a brownfield...not a clean greenfield site. All of the parking would have to be removed. I also question the need to have a connection running right through the middle of the site

which is being called for, here, as a public easement, because frankly that actually devalues the site in terms of the ability to build affordable housing on it. Look, that connectivity is really not necessary with the connection further to the south. So, there is just a little bit of work that needs to be done, but I am committed to bringing it back and having the site as a future site for affordable housing as soon as possible. And I give my commitment to this Council for that. I have been spearheading affordable housing projects for a number of years. We did build Sir Paul Martin Estates on Chrislind. We have another two acres available now with Winnipeg Housing on Transcona Boulevard that we have earmarked as a Council. And they have got some big issues there that they are working through in terms of the soil from the Park City Commons that was dumped on their site that they got removed. And...but they are working that through and they have been filing applications towards the HAF, as well. And these...this one takes a little bit of lifting, as well, just because of the nature of the site not being connected, being land locked, because of the concrete parking on the site, because of the bike path that I want to make sure is preserved as City-owned land. But I want to commit to bring this back as early as possible because I support affordable housing on this site. So, thank you, through the Chair, for supporting. And I hope all members of Council support the amendment, thank you. And I will support the clause accordingly.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Schreyer.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. So, a bit of a whirlwind this evening in terms of dealing with this report item just given, well, the seriousness of it. We are dealing with the seriousness of declaring surplus assets and dealing with the seriousness of affordable housing. And in this case, just to clarify, because the amendment has changed from an hour ago. We...it is regarding...my concerns were over what is on this report item 545 Munroe, which is the home of the Elmwood Community Resource Centre. They have been there for nine years now after sort of going through another flurry of events back in 2015 in order to secure the Elmwood Community Resource Centre a home, which they love. And in fact, it is in recent years, the last couple of years, that the Elmwood Community Resource Centre led by Nina Condo, the Executive Director, had been looking themselves at developing an affordable housing project. Very ambitious one, as a matter of fact, with a specific consideration to housing for women and families suffering from family violence. And on that case, being aware of their work to create affordable housing, notable number of housing, I have been very...rather...well, rather aware and rather supportive, of course. It happens to be that the concern was whether they could get this done in time and Nina was scared and therefore, so was I. Having said that, in the last hour, it has been...been, well, made clear to us, including by Sherri Rollins, and as well as members of the administration; Moira Geer, Richard Mahe, that they are, in fact, going to work with the Elmwood Community Resource Centre. That is starting...not starting, they already have, but continuing tomorrow to work with the Nina Condo and the Elmwood Community Resource Centre to work towards achieving their goal of affordable housing project on this property. It is not just this property. If you look at the item it does show two addresses, because the address next door happens, as well, to be City-owned property. It happens to be the property of a former firehall. And on that basis, being able to sell them together makes for the ability to have a rather...rather significant housing project. And on that basis, since we have had that extra guarantee in the last hour, I am pleased to hear that, so is Nina Condo. And with support for the Elmwood...for the Elmwood Community Resource Centre to continue their work with the administration to create that affordable housing project, I am glad to rescind that aspect of the amendment. Having said that, we are always looking at the intent of these things. And sometimes, things do not exactly fit the intent. Sometimes you need someone specific to sort of point that out. And in this case, none other than Russ Wyatt who, let's face it, knows a thing or two about development in Transcona. How do we know that? Well, you do not have to take my word about it. We can all talk about it. I happened to have been witness to it as a member of the Community Committee. And this year, and, in fact, in my first term, looking at a significant amount of development, a significant amount of notably dense development here and there, for which he has always stood by dense development because it does make it more affordable. In fact, just in this month alone, we have had two community committees in Transcona in which we were developing neighbourhoods for...with hundreds of units. In fact, just last week, we had a...what, a nine-hour meeting? Half of which...just on Monday. I wish it was further away, but anyway, a nine-hour meeting that I had to chair, and keeping up with Russ Wyatt...And so, and hats off to the administration, our Clerks Office, for doing that, as well because it was a very ambitious large neighbourhood, almost 1,500 units to this new neighbourhood, including affordable housing apartments and to which Russ Wyatt stood by to make sure that there was a full gamut of types of housing in this new neighbourhood. So, look, that is Russ Wyatt's testament to density and affordable housing. That cannot be denied. So, all I can do is look at this in the same pattern. Russ Wyatt is being consistent with his vision for real neighbourhoods, densification in these neighbourhoods, including affordable housing. Just this week, as well. So, on that basis, when Russ Wyatt says this does not work, that makes sense to me. He has pointed out why this does not fit the other affordable housing units that he has been working towards, not just...not just this week, which he obviously did, because it got past, it is going on the next...going up to...well, given all the amendments to it, you know Councillor Wyatt, going up the chain to the Property, Planning and Development Committee to get to EPC. And in this case, you know, I am going to be a little sensational in this case. Sometimes, you know, maybe someone wants to make Portage Avenue a landing strip. And well, maybe it does not fit. Well, you can...what are you going to say? He is against air travel or avionic tourism or trade? Well, no. Sometimes you just do not have the fit. Alright, that was an exaggeration. I admit to that one. But having said that...you like that one? Well, can you imagine? So anyway, in this case, Councillor Wyatt is

simply saying this is not the fit. On Monday, there was a fit, and he fought for that. And he made sure. This one is not. And that is why there is an exception in this case. That is why he is asking for this amendment. And thank you to Councillor Rollins for having been part of solving this amendment issue in the last hour or two, and to the administration. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Mayor Gillingham.

Mayor Gillingham: Madam Speaker, thank you. I took the bait; I am trying to imagine where planes would land on Portage Avenue and I cannot find it. Top of monorail, well...well played, Councillor Mayes, well played. Channeling of former Mayor, Stephen Juba. Nonetheless, I just want to rise to say I will be supporting the main clause and the amending motion, as well. I want to thank Councillors Rollins and Wyatt for working together. Appreciate hearing that Councillor Wyatt will be bringing this, hopefully, back to make it available for affordable housing and just working out some of the details that need to be worked out. I also wanted to take a moment just to thank this Standing Committee and Councillor Rollins and her leadership. This is very important. We have been talking for quite some time about identifying lands...and I want to thank our staff for this doing this, as well, for the work they did. Identifying City of Winnipeg lands, and we can deem surplus and declare surplus so that we can get housing built on them and specifically here we are looking at affordable housing. I won't belabour the point and repeat what is been said at length about the need for more housing, but I just want to thank all those involved in getting us to this point here.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Rollins, do you wish to close? Or first it will be the amending motion. Pardon me. Councillor Wyatt? No. Councillor Rollins?

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, if you could call the question.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. All in favour of amending Motion 15? Contrary? That is carried. And all in favour of the main item, as amended, 16? Contrary? That is carried. Okay. Onto the notice of motion. It is under Property and Development. It is from the July 18th Council meeting. Moved by Councillor Wyatt and seconded by Councillor Orlikow regarding the development application timeline. Okay, and there is also an amending motion that goes with this, Motion 7; moved by the Mayor and seconded by Councillor Wyatt. Okay. Councillor Wyatt, your opportunity to introduce the main motion.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
NOTICE OF MOTION

Councillor Wyatt: Sorry, go ahead.

Madam Speaker: Go ahead.

Councillor Wyatt: No, I think it has been moved by Councillor...I think it has been referred. We have a motion? There is another motion...

Madam Speaker: ...There is an amending motion...

Councillor Wyatt: ...Right. Yes...

Madam Speaker: ...Yes. And we will get to that...

Councillor Wyatt: ...Okay, very good...

Madam Speaker: ...Okay, do you want to hand it over to the Mayor?

Councillor Wyatt: ...I will stand by and let the mover of the amending motion speak.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. Mr. Mayor.

Motion No. 7

**Moved by His Worship Mayor Gillingham,
Seconded by Councillor Wyatt,**

WHEREAS a Process Improvement Review of the development procedures is being undertaken under the terms of the Housing Accelerator Funding agreement;

AND WHEREAS prior to implementing the changes, the review should identify recommendations as they relate to process improvements undertaken as part of the Housing Accelerator Fund;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Notice of Motion titled ‘Development Application Timelines’ be amended by adding the words “That the Public Service be directed to report back in Q2 2025 on specific improvements undertaken or recommended to meet the intent of the following:” immediately after “THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED”

Mayor Gillingham: I simply want to thank Councillor Wyatt and Councillor Orlikow, as well, for their original motion. Councillor Wyatt and I worked on a motion here...an amendment here that really would task the Public Service with reporting back on specific improvements undertaken or recommended to meet the intent of the following, immediately after the ‘therefore be it resolved’. So, I think it is pretty straightforward here. We are going to send it to the process and the consultant and have our staff report back on these improvements.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Which motion are we on here?

Madam Speaker: 7. It goes with the notice of motion that is on the electronic agenda. Okay. No further speakers? Mr. Mayor, do you wish to close? No. Councillor Wyatt? I will call the question.

Councillor Wyatt: I would like to thank the Mayor for moving the motion to refer and to keep the matter alive. And it is definitely something we have heard about in our...from different applicants and welcome the fact that there is actually a process available through the consultant who has been hired related to the HAF to look at options with regards to increasing the speed by which applications come to us to community committees for hearings, as well as the back end of that once the hearing is approved, trying to figure out what resources are required or what the issues are at Property and Development, and across the organization, Legal, as well, with regards to signing off for executing the development agreements, which sometimes is taking upwards of 12 months to 18 months. So, we have constricted the amount of time that we can lay matters over at a public hearing up to, basically, the equivalent of three months. But the front end and the back end has been an issue even though with Bill 37 we have certain timeframes that have to be met. But it was deemed that the application is not complete, that is part of the issue as well from the point of view of those who are making applications. So, we will...hopefully we can find some solutions to that to ensure the process moves smoother and faster. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Okay. Thank you. With that, I will call the question on amending Motion 7. All in favour? Contrary? Carried. And the main notice of motion, as amended. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now move under...move on to by-laws under P and D for first reading only. Councillor Wyatt, you are declaring a conflict on 108/2024? For the...which item? That is the rezoning land on Court Avenue and the...

Councillor Wyatt: Yes. Financial, yes.

Madam Speaker: Pecuniary. Thank you. He did say pecuniary, yes. Okay, and Councillor...

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 1ST READ ONLY**

Councillor Rollins: Yes. I move that the following by-laws be read a first time, Madam Speaker: By-law No. 108/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. We will just wait a moment, we can deal with the other items. If we can have Councillor Wyatt back. Okay. We could move on. Perhaps...

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, did you want me to move on?

Madam Speaker: I just...he is...just a moment. Okay. Go ahead.

Councillor Rollins: Okay. Thank you. I move the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 105/2024, By-law No. 106/2024, By-law No. 107/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 105/2024, By-law No. 106/2024, By-law No. 107/2024.

Madam Speaker: Next set of by-laws for second and third reading. Councillor Wyatt? Item 20? And that is Court Avenue. Pecuniary conflict, as you have stated. Just stand by, please. Do not go too far away. Thank you.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – 2ND AND 3RD READINGS

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, By-law No. 20/2024, so moved.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried...

Councillor Rollins: ...Can I move it a third time...

Madam Speaker: ...We will let the Clerk read. Go ahead, Madam Clerk, read the item into the...

Clerk: By-law No. 20/2024.

Madam Speaker: Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that...

Madam Speaker: ...We will have Councillor Wyatt back...

Councillor Rollins: ...No, Madam Speaker. Sorry. If I may, move for a third reading of By-law 20/2024, Madam Speaker. And then I will continue on.

Madam Speaker: I do not have that on my sheet, but yes, go ahead.

Councillor Rollins: Okay, so moved. By-law No. 20/2024 for a second and third reading now.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. That is just second reading, I believe.

Councillor Rollins: Shall we go for the third reading then? I think that was third.

Madam Speaker: Just two readings.

Councillor Rollins: No, we are going to do three. Can we do a third at the same time?

Madam Speaker: ...Madam Clerk...

Clerk: By-law No. 20/2024.

Madam Speaker: That one does not have a third reading.

Councillor Rollins: It did have a third reading...

Madam Speaker: ...Mr. Clerk? It does. Okay. Thank you. I see it now. Thank you.

Councillor Rollins: Alright, I will move that By-law No. 62/2024 be read for a second time, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 62/2024.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that By-law 62/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I failed to say that for 20/2024. I think that Council knew my meaning that I intended that third to be read and that the same to be passed in order to be signed and sealed, but I will leave it to the Clerks. FYI.

Madam Speaker: Yes, that is noted. Next. The question?

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PROPERTY AND DEVELOPMENT
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS – THREE READINGS

Councillor Rollins: I move that the following by-laws be read a first time: By-law No. 110/2024, By-law No. 113/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 110/2024, By-law No. 113/2024.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, I move that By-laws No. 110/2024 and 113/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 110/2024, By-law No. 113/2024.

Councillor Rollins: I move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 110/2024 and 113/2024 be read a third time and that the same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We will now have question period under this committee. Any questions for the Chair?

Councillor Rollins: I feel like there is more items. No, we are good. Sorry. Question Period, yes.

Madam Speaker: Any questions? Seeing none, let's move to the next committee. Councillor Duncan, you have been waiting for this Committee on Water and Waste and the Environment.

REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 9, 2024

Councillor Duncan: Yes, waiting my whole life. Here we go. Before I do introduce this report, I just wanted to thank Councillor Mayes for his time as Chair of this committee. And now being a year into my time on the Executive Policy Committee, I know the amount of commitment and work that takes. So, for his long-standing tenure on the EPC Committee, as well, through several Mayors. Congratulations and thank you for your time on that. I would like to introduce the report of September 9th and move adoption of consent agenda Items 1 through 4.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: (inaudible) please.

Madam Speaker: 1? Yes, just 1? Okay. I will call the question on 2 through 4. All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Item 1 – Building Emissions Reduction Strategy

Madam Speaker: Councillor Duncan, the Chair.

Councillor Duncan: I will wait to hear from my Councillor colleague.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes.

Councillor Mayes: Yes, thank to Councillor Duncan for the generous remarks. That is very decent of him. This should probably be read in conjunction with the notice of motion put forward by Councillor Gilroy and myself today. We should do something on building emissions. We have some commitment to that in the Strategic Plan. The Mayor had some commitment to that in his platform. I do not think I have ever seen, though, here at No. 1, a layover to consider whether to grant a layover. So, the layover requested after a year is can we have another six months, please. So, we are...we would completely miss this budget cycle and be onto the next. Two things; So I would encourage you to read the notice of motion which we will be debating next month which would, perhaps, catch this budget rotation in terms of trying to do something on building retrofits and recognizing the social benefit of reducing carbon emissions. That social benefit was vital, it was the key, in fact, that produced a positive cost benefit analysis. When one looks at the Kenaston widening. We are not revisiting that debate, but I did say that I thought that set an interesting and, perhaps, valuable precedent that we should go and consider the social benefit of carbon reduction in other contexts. This is one of them. So, we will come to that debate next month on the Kenaston math and how it can be applied on building retrofits. We will come to that next month and probably, hopefully, refer it to the budget process. For today, I leave it to the Committee to decide whether they want to grant this extension. I will, however, point out that if you go back to the building report that was done in September of 2023, where we had asked for the most cost efficient model, if you could spend up to fifteen buildings and up to 80 million bucks, what would you do, City of Winnipeg, to reduce carbon emissions? There is a remarkable inclusion in there, remarkable in that it would save only five tonnes of carbon emission per year for five million dollars. To give you a context, we dropped about seven million, maybe, with the Province at Brady and we...to do the flaring. That saves 95,000 tonnes. 95,000 tonnes each year, versus this odd inclusion of a proposal to have a five-million-dollar retrofit that would only take five tonnes. And then you say, well, what building was that? Well, it is the Eldon Ross Pool. And something tells me, maybe we should not be spending five million dollars to energy retrofit the Eldon Ross Pool because we are trying to sell it. So, if the Committee goes back and decides to grant the six-months extension to the year-long extension, could you please ask the staff why a couple of months before the Eldon Ross Pool was suggested in the budget for sale, the staff also suggested dropping five million dollars to save virtually nothing. Was not really an energy retrofit at all, it was just a...fixing up an old building, clearly. But why that would have been identified as a cost-efficient way to spend five million dollars to save energy. Hopefully, we can just delete it and then, frankly, the Mayes/Gilroy motion looks even better for the math. Now you are down to 45 million, not 50, and you are still saving the same amount. Now it looks even better. So, I leave it to the Committee to decide whether or not they want to lay this over further and I will vote for the request for 30 days. But please, when you are back at the Committee, can you please ask them, what the hell with this recommendation on Eldon Ross Pool if two months later, the City staff are saying let's sell the thing?

Madam Speaker: Thank you, Councillor Mayes. Any further speakers? Seeing none, Councillor Duncan to close.

Councillor Duncan: Yes, thank you very much, Madam Speaker. Excellent points, and those questions will be raised. Call the question.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Okay, we now have a notice of motion, moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Gilroy. It will appear on next month's Council agenda. It is regarding the carbon tax payment and obligations. We have no by-laws under this committee. We will now move into question period. Any questions for Councillor Duncan, our Chair? Any questions? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Community Services.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON WATER, WASTE AND ENVIRONMENT
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 3

**Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Gilroy,**

WHEREAS the Public Service estimated a cumulative total carbon tax and utility cost savings of \$9.2m by 2030, based on \$50.6m in retrofit investments for city infrastructure, as identified in a report adopted by Council on September 29, 2023;

AND WHEREAS that report provided no cost estimate for the social benefit of reducing carbon emissions by 2,735 tonnes per year, which would be the annual reduction resulting from the \$50.6m retrofit investment;

AND WHEREAS the appendix titled 'Route 90 Improvements Benefit-Cost Analysis Technical Report', included with the report adopted by Council on June 27, 2024, cites a social benefit of \$250 per tonne saved, thereby crediting the Route 90 widening with "environmental benefits" worth \$12.6m over 25 years (2,021 tonnes per year for 25 years totaling 50,537 tonnes) ;

AND WHEREAS the "social benefit" of the \$50.6m in building retrofits produces 68,375 tonnes in carbon emission savings over 25 years (2,735 x 25), worth \$17.1M using the Benefit-Cost Analysis (BCA) approach;

AND WHEREAS the retrofits will produce 36 percent greater social/environmental benefit than the Route 90 widening proposal approved by Council, at less than 1/3 of the cost (\$50m vs \$164m);

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED THAT the estimated \$50.6 million cost of retrofit investments, as identified in the report titled "Retrofits to Reduce Carbon Tax Payment Obligations" adopted by Council on September 29, 2023, be referred the 2025 Budget Update Process.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
DATED SEPTEMBER 10, 2024**

Councillor Santos: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I introduce the report and move adoption of consent agenda Items No. 1 and 2.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Thank you, Chair, Councillor Santos. We now have Motion 4, and this is moved by Councillor Mayes, seconded by Councillor Allard. It is an automatic referral to the Standing Committee.

Councillor Mayes: Unless I speak to that and try to get it considered today?

Madam Speaker: That is right.

Councillor Mayes: Okay.

Madam Speaker: Councillor Mayes wishes to suspend the rules. Councillor Mayes?

Councillor Mayes: Yes, of those present. Thank you to Clerk Cowan for clarifying that.

Madam Speaker: Okay. So, you wish to suspend the rules to deal with the item today?

Councillor Mayes: Yes.

Madam Speaker: Yes. Okay, I will call the question on that. That would require two-thirds. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Okay.

Councillor Mayes: So much for that.

Madam Speaker: Okay. And now the item, Motion 4, Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES
MOTIONS

Motion No. 4

Moved by Councillor Mayes,
Seconded by Councillor Allard,

WHEREAS Louise Johnston served as a School Trustee for over 30 years;

AND WHEREAS the family of William Johnstone has provided their written support in renaming the park, currently named William Johnstone Park, located at 173 Vista Avenue;

AND WHEREAS William Johnstone has also been honoured with a street named after him;

AND WHEREAS on July 13, 2022, the park renaming was referred to the Welcoming Winnipeg Process by the Executive Policy Committee;

AND WHEREAS the requested renaming has not yet been processed;

AND WHEREAS the outdoor classroom within William Johnstone Park has been completed and is ready to open;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That the outdoor classroom located within William Johnstone Park at 173 Vista Avenue, be named for Louise Johnston.*
2. *That funding for the signage be approved from the Riel Community Committee Land Dedication Reserve Fund (St. Vital Ward allocation).*
3. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to fulfill the intent of the foregoing.*

Councillor Mayes: Noting the hour, I will try and be brief. We have a logjam at the City of Winnipeg. A number of park and renamings are...have run into a process difficulty with the Welcoming Winnipeg process. Former CAO Mike Jack talked about this at a relatively recent meeting. This impasse will be solved in some way at some point, but we do not know. So, I have got two parks out there to be named for gold medal winning curlers that are stalled out. There is also this one for Louise Johnston who Councillor Allard has honoured, as well. So, the idea was to rename William Johnstone Park for Louise Johnston, which seemed appropriate as it is right next to Penner School in St. Vital. Louise was a long-time School Trustee. Interestingly, she actually survived two different boards that she sat on. She was a Norwood Division school trustee with Nancy Allen before Nancy got into provincial politics. Then, she was a St. Boniface School Division trustee. Survived the collapse of that when it became Louis Riel. And then, was a long-time Louis Riel School Division trustee. Very proud of her Métis heritage. That is on her Twitter page, front and centre. So, we do not know when we are going to be done with the impasse on the park naming. Dave Domke, to his credit, has pointed out, one can just name park assets, park amenities for people. That is not covered under the Welcoming Winnipeg. We have an outdoor classroom in this park. It is well used and well loved by the kids at Penner School. It was in the budget 2023. It is done. I would like to open it, but it seems kind of weird to be opening something in a park that you are going to rename. We are stalled out. I would request we name the amenity. It is a classroom. She was a school trustee. It is outside. It is right by a school. We can honour this nice woman. Councillor Allard, hopefully, will come with me to do that. That is the request, really. Can we just name this outdoor classroom, which has no name? There would be the cost of a sign. Councillor Lukes correctly pointed that out to me. I will cover that. We put up a sign calling it the Louise Johnston outdoor classroom. We do it bilingually, and away we go. That would be the request. Why do I ask to suspend the rules? Because it does not seem controversial and this way we can get this thing opened before the snow flies, hopefully. It is a nice little amenity. Some good work Ian Legge and colleagues with City Parks. Really, very good work, frankly. It came in under budget and on time. This seems to be a way out of the impasse. I do not know about other parks that other Councillors may have. I am not trying to end run them but trying to get out of this impasse for this particular park, I would like to name the outdoor classroom that has been paid for, it is completed, is on City property for former-trustee Johnston. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Madam Speaker, over the years as a School Board Trustee in the Seven Oaks School Division, we were all members of what is called the Manitoba Association of School Board Trustees at the time. I believe it has changed its name. But I cannot think, Madam Speaker, of anybody more worthy to have something named after her than Louise Johnston. She was a wonderful woman to work with, cared so much about education for kids, and was all...whenever I had the opportunity to work with her at MAST, that is what it was all about. And I just want to give great kudos to the Councillor for St. Vital for moving such a thing forward. And it is frustrating. It is very clear on Welcoming Winnipeg, it says, "We are years behind, please be patient." I do not see any reason why this outdoor classroom could not be named after her by us, Council. There is no controversy about this woman. It is all positive. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Mayes, do you wish to close?

Councillor Mayes: Cannot top that.

Madam Speaker: I will call the question on Motion 4. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Okay. We have no by-laws under this committee, so we will move onto Question Period. Any questions for our new Chair, or for Councillor Santos? Councillor Mayes.

STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON COMMUNITY SERVICES QUESTION PERIOD

Councillor Mayes: As I was saying when I was critic for arenas and when I was so rudely interrupted back in 2012, to pick up on my train of thought...Given advanced notice to Councillor Santos of the question. To her credit, she has already replied. Question is about arenas. The last new arena we built in this town was 1975. So, they are all...they are all getting to be 50 years old plus. The last time we combined with the Province and the community centres to build three new sheets to (inaudible) and one up in Councillor Wyatt's area, was in the Selinger – Harper – Sam Katz era of 2013 that we did that. So we have not knocked it out of the park, to say the least. We have actually done rather poorly on arenas. However, in 2022 Councillor Allard and I moved to allocate the eight million dollars in provincial money that was to go to arenas. To our credit, I think, we managed to move to have some of that money go into every ward. Councillor Lukes does not have an arena so we are putting some extra money to Councillor Chambers' ward. It is going slowly, I felt. Councillor Santos, to her credit, voted for that motion. It was 9-7. She is the only one now on EPC who voted for that motion. So, can you update us please on the state of the arena, the eight million dollars? We have got these decrepit arenas. We have got provincial money. Can we not spend it?

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Santos...

Councillor Santos: ...(inaudible) I have 15 minutes to answer. Thank you to my Council colleague, Councillor Mayes. He did email me, gave me a heads-up so I do appreciate that. And I followed up with Geoff Patton to get us an update on where we are at with the eight million dollars towards funding arenas, especially with wanting some urgent and immediate priorities and repairs. To date, the last update was provided in April, all of Council has have it, but now we have a new update. We...in April it was three out of ten larger projects were complete, and now we have moved up from three to six. So six of the ten larger projects are completed, and the work will be continuing on in the remaining priority projects in 2024 into 2025. Geoff, Mr. Patton, had advised me that he will be sending an update to all of Council for everybody to take a look at. And then my understanding is we have spent nearly half, so approximately four million dollars out of the eight million, in Phase One, and then Phase Two and Phase Three are still ongoing. As a new Chair, I am committed to obviously work with Councillor Mayes and the Public Service to move these projects a little bit more expeditiously. I do understand that this has been a long going issue since 2022 but as the new Chair, I do promise to continue on with those efforts. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Second question.

Councillor Mayes: Yes and I want to thank...If...had Councillor Santos not voted for this back in 2022, it actually would have failed on an 8-8 vote, so thank you to her for her support. It is doling out money throughout the City. I guess my concern is, and I will wait and see what the written update is, but the last update some things were falling a year later than they had originally been said, and when I said why is this delayed? The answer was because it is delayed, which is not really an answer to a question. So, thank you to Councillor Santos. So, it is...I guess the point here is to make sure, if we are going to ask the province for money, and get it, we should not take five years to spend it, I would say. It would be like saying to the current NDP government you are too late. We cannot spend this till after the next election now. So,

we have got to get this money out the door if we are going to ask for it and get it. So, thank you to Councillor Santos for the response and do you know when we might get this next update from Mr. Patton?

Councillor Santos: Yes. He said he was going to send it right after this Council meeting, so you might get it Friday, or I can actually forward the email to everybody right now.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, next committee is the Standing Policy Committee on Public Works. Councillor Lukes, our Chair.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
DATED SEPTEMBER 12, 2024**

Councillor Lukes: Yes, Madam Speaker. I would like to move consent agenda for Items No. 2 through 5.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Councillor Gilroy? Okay. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried.

Item 1 – North Garage Replacement Project Budget Status

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes to introduce the item.

Councillor Lukes: I guess I will hear from my Councillor colleagues first and then I will close with my statements.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Gilroy.

Councillor Gilroy: Thank you, Madam Speaker. I will not be supporting the motion that is in front of us here today. I just cannot believe that within the information that we have, Madam Speaker, that we are not moving forward this...forward with this. We know we have this Transit Master Plan that is coming forward. We have electrified our fleet, which we really need this garage to happen. Now, we have put money into community centres and other areas that have went over budget, and we need to...we need to make sure that we have a place for our transit fleet. And this is really vital to how we grow our transit. And so, I am very, very concerned that we are not moving forward with this. And I heard what the delegates have to say, and I share those concerns if we do not move forward. Now, this...now, this is a challenge for us, because we are not...I do not think that we are ensuring that when we are getting these quotes that we are doing it properly. And now we are always becoming over budget, which is a major concern. But this is one area on our transit when we are about to be starting a major new transit lines and changing our transit and electrifying with new vehicles. This is not the time that we should be not investing in this. So, I have major concerns that we are not moving forward. If this is a concern with budget restraints, then maybe we should be looking at the community centre that we just allowed to go over budget and look at phasing that in more so that we have money for our transit building. Like, I just do not understand why we are not moving forward with this, Madam Speaker. So, I share the concerns of those that are in delegation today and think that we should be prioritizing this. We have prioritized transit. And we need to...this has been on the works for a long time, Madam Speaker. And we...we as a Council have prioritized transit, and I cannot believe that we are not looking at this garage and deeming it necessary to do the upgrades that we need to do. Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Eadie...pardon me, Councillor Mayes, then Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Mayes: Okay. Well, actually I do not agree with Councillor Gilroy on that. I actually some...somewhat to my own surprise, totally support Councillor Lukes' position on this. It is...for a couple of reasons, it is actually quite an important vote, I think. I had been planning for about a year to denounce Councillor Lukes because she had said, when we debated the...the bringing Transit Plus in-house, well, my god, or words to that effect, this is going to cost us, you know, six million dollars more for the garage, if we bring this in. Six million dollars. So, I have been waiting and waiting for her to approve a massive cost overrun for the other things in that garage. And I could say, oh, you shortchanged the disabled community. But no, to her credit, she has been consistent here, I would say, and said, no, we...we do not have it. We do not have the money to do this. I think it is important for the reasons I blathered on about earlier with the...With the CSO system, we built in a 100 percent contingency, so of course, no one ever wants to do it because it looks so expensive. Whereas this, you... it's like, well, we will put it in the budget, it has got a 100 percent potential override. Here we are, we are only 55 percent over. Well, this have...you have to send a message, I think, to the Public Service and to the public at some point and say, no, we cannot just keep rubber stamping any cost overrun. We have to draw the line. So, I appreciate what Councillor Gilroy is saying, but I think there is a bigger principle here, which is, A...well,

the small principle, perhaps, is, look, we did not expand the garage budget to accommodate better service for disabled patrons, so I do not think it would be fair to now say, well, let's expand the budget to accommodate able bodied patrons. But the larger point is, look, we all like to spend more money on a lot of things, but we are not able to do that and I think it is fair to say to the Public Service, you are going to have to go back and revisit this and not just say, whoa, it is an old estimate and oh. Otherwise, it becomes the game. The game was, and I asked Catherine Kloepper and Liza Pablo at this month, give me an example of anything we have ever put in the budget as a class five that we ever bounced out when it came back as a class three. And they, you know, wrestled with, well, what about that Archibald...Marion Archibald thing. And no, that was not because of the cost, that was because we moved it over to Waverley Underpass. Really, at some point, you have to say, well, is the standard just once you get in, whatever the overrun, we will pay it? That should not be the standard. So no, actually, I agree with the EPC recommendation here. Try and fit within the existing envelope. That will have side effects, but I think that is the fair way to do this given how we voted on the Transit Plus item, and frankly, I think it sends an important message to people in Water and Waste and other departments that, yes, you are going to have to live up to the cost estimates. So, on this one, I actually agree with Councillor Lukes.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Eadie.

Councillor Eadie: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is a tough one to vote for, I have to say. Madam Speaker, I just want to start off by just making one statement. This project, Madam Speaker, is about the whole city and its consideration of the city. And, you know, other projects do go out of price, but in a sense, what is happening here is to fit within that 200 million dollar envelope, they are going to be doing what is called value engineering, which has been done to every...there was value engineering done on the brand new outdoor pool-spray pad over in Transcona. There is value engineering over at the St. James Civic Centre. There is value engineering in many different places. Now, this is a huge amount of money, though, to do some value engineering. I do have, like, a problem with it, but what was asked of the Public Service, as I was listening to the Public Works meeting, Madam Speaker, to look at are there components that we can build after the main need is met? And I think there is still a report to come back at...on that. When Councillor Lukes closes, she can...she can let me know. But because how they are...how they are going to achieve it...we heard from someone who is actually heavily involved in transit, Mr. Scott. And he pointed out some serious concerns. And yes, the existing North Garage, there is...that thing is so...like, it is amazed...I am amazed it has not fallen in yet, Madam Speaker. It is very old, like, very old. It was built before I was born. So, Madam Speaker, you know, it is really tough for me to decide if I want to vote for this because, you know, I do not know if we put enough pressure on the Province yet to throw in, but I have to say, in almost every other province, the amount of investment from the province in the transit system is huge as compared to what happens in this province. And I see that, oh, we extended the gas tax relief now till December 31st, when the Province says they do not have enough money, Madam Speaker. Now, election promises. Well, you know, geez, Madam Speaker, at some point you could make a promise, but you have a reality that has to be dealt with, Madam Speaker. And there are other decisions that elected people can make in order to make this thing go according to building it the way it should be built. There could be some value engineering. But I do not know that we pushed hard enough yet. Somehow rally the public, or whatever, Madam Speaker. We only heard from one other individual from outside...like, with...involved with other groups. Now, the money is not everywhere. On our project in the north...over up in the...up in the north Winnipeg, I call it; Phase Two, way over budget. But in that case, Madam Speaker, we are not talking about here, we are going to go to the user fee, and we are going to raise it. I do not want to raise it. We want our...more people will ride the bus the cheaper it is and the more convenient it is. It is not going to be very convenient if we do not get this garage built, Madam Speaker. But on the water side, we have only...We have to build it. Just like we have to build this new garage to have a proper transit system. And in the end, we are going to have to go after the water bill payers. If we cannot get money from the Province and the Feds, extra, we are going to be going after the water bill payers. That is the reality. No, that is the reality. You know, nobody wants to charge taxes. Nobody wants to do all these things, but you know what? The reality is, if you want to get to deliver the proper service, we have not looked at that. And so, that is why I am having trouble deciding to vote for this or not. So, but when I...Here in closing, I just want to confirm that the Public Service was sent back to say which components are okay to build in subsequent years from now? You will note all the additions that over the years we have done over on Osborne over there, right? On Brandon or whatever. We did not build the main enchilada all together, right? As the system expanded, we expanded what we had out there. So, anyway, I will leave it at that, Madam Speaker. In the next, what do I got, three minutes or whatever to decide how to vote, but I just...I just...yes, I am just concerned that they went with option three. And I think we could have tried maybe harder on a couple of those other options. Thanks.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Rollins, followed by Mayor Gillingham.

Councillor Rollins: Madam Speaker, you know, whether it is the 50/50 deal on transit that we lost around 2016 or it was news in the middle of the pandemic in 2020 that I think Mayor Bowman did a really good job in outlining the major difference that was only had in our city and in cities in New Brunswick, where our province did not come to the table for transit. They did not come in line with the Federal Safe Restart Program that Canada had maybe provided a bit too generous of terms to support provinces that were also feeling the budget pinch. And Manitoba did not pair any money

with the money that, you know, the Federal Government gave Manitoba in the Safe Restart Program. And despite the fact that on paper, the Province was supposed to match the funds. And so, whether it is operational losses that Winnipeg has suffered or it is a federal ISIP program that definitely we are not going to be carrying a third, a third, a third. Something has to give. And we cannot look at our capital projects in isolation. We cannot. We cannot afford to. I am...I remain frustrated at the delegations this morning, Madam Speaker, because there is oftentimes where I think the math is just left to us. And I think sometimes city budgets, as all budgets are, are somewhat inaccessible. But when you have the President of the ATU come, and there is a real absence of advocacy, I get concerned. What I want from labour in this city, is to stand shoulder and shoulder with this Council. Sure, there will be times where we disagree, Madam Speaker, but when it comes to the health of our transit system, the health of the city's infrastructure, there should be no room between us. And so, when they are not meeting with the Province or the Feds, they are not doing the job. I have outlined this for more than one president of the ATU. And as a labour endorsed candidate, I am frankly disappointed, Madam Speaker. And I have kind of had it with people not understanding the crux of the matter of our finances in the City of Winnipeg and what has been happening federally and provincially. We have no legislative powers to expand our revenue without the Province. We cannot go over budget by their legislation, so something has to give. And all of us, both things can be true. We can love and create a wonderful Master Transit Plan, the transportation plan that Councillor Lukes has aptly been leading, that we have all done consultations. And then, we can outline these priorities, some of them very inspirational, Madam Speaker. But when it comes to budgeting for the priorities, for sure we have to make choices. But at the same time, we have to lobby really hard. And when partners like the ATU fail in that regard, they fail the City and we can partner with them. So, I was happy to hear the President of the ATU has a meeting tomorrow morning. And I would encourage labour to continue those meetings because there was something wrong with the Province not coming to the table for transit. But when the Province and the Feds do not come to the table on housing, on daycare, on transit, on water; we have got a...we have got a problem. And it is a problem that everyone can lean into. From the climate change activists to labour unions, from every member of this Council in line with their Winnipeg City Councillors, their Winnipeg MLAs, our Winnipeg Premier, to understand if we want to move on climate, if we want to move on building this great city, then we are going to need partners with serious cash at the table to free up some revenue sources for us. And for heavens' sakes, not to be able to ignore federal provincial plans and vacate tables that we desperately need them at. I want everyone leaning in on this because these tough choices will have to continue. If we do not, and that is not on anyone's shoulders. Yes, we make some decisions that might not benefit the whole of the city, perhaps, in some folks' view. But I want those folks to turn around and start looking at the stark differences that many reports, from New Brunswick to Manitoba, have outlined of what happened during the pandemic, the revenue that we never even got at the table. The pleas to journalists to actually cover it, because frankly, it was covered better in New Brunswick than it was Manitoba. Why? Because maybe we are the largest city and maybe it was just us. But you know what? This met region has the majority of population in this province, so folks should care. Folks should care. And that is how you get this labour-endorsed Councillor to get a fire in her belly and start saying, pony up labour. You have got a job to do in lobbying.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next speaker is Mayor Gillingham, followed by Councillor...Councillor Schreyer.

Mayor Gillingham: In church, we say 'amen' to that. So, I just...I just appreciate, through you, Madam Speaker, Councillor Rollins' comments. Councillor Mayes' comments, as well. Especially, I think the two of them really have captured so much for us here today. And I certainly support...It is difficult. It is a difficult decision, but I certainly support Councillor Lukes and the Public Works Committee on their recommendation. A couple of things I...matters I do want to put on the record. I think, first of all, we have to keep in...this project in context. I do not think it is fair to compare this project with building a community centre in an area of the city that has...a recreation centre, I should say, 55...60,000 people with no...with no centre at all. There is a couple of small community centres, but no community centre. There is...this is an ISIP-related project. I want to take us back to that. Councillor Mayes took us back a little bit to that one. I want to take us back to the fact that this North Garage is one of the ISIP projects that we agreed to under, you know, a former...former term. And I voted for that. A lot of us voted for that. I think it was good leadership by everyone around the table including then Mayor Bowman. There was a point in time when federal money, provincial money was available. That did not happen very often. We jumped on it. We knew we were walking into this with a class five estimate. Couple that with the fact that between 20...2017 and 2023, Councillor Schreyer probably knows this number off by heart, but in all seriousness, construction inflation has gone up 55 percent. So, it is not that our staff have blown it with establishing these numbers. These are classified numbers that have been the subject of and been impacted by significant construction inflation. But the ISIP program, and you have heard me say this before, was predicated on a formula. It is fully subscribed across Canada. There is no more money in the program, but it was...the formula was this: the Federal Government would put in 40 percent to pay for the project, the Province would put in 33.3 percent, and the City would put in around 27 percent of eligible costs. What we are seeing right now in the...in our new (inaudible) project with the costs rising at 2.3 million and maybe perhaps going up, is that we are looking, for example, on what we have agreed to so far under ISIP, that unless the Province and the Feds step up and do something more, we will be paying, I think it is about 58 percent, not 27, but 58 percent of the cost or somewhere in that neighbourhood, which is why we await the updated rate report that will be coming to us some time later this fall. And it will show...what we are going to have to ask

ratepayers to do if the Feds and Province do not step up and fund that project. There is an announcement that was made by the Federal Government that there is a new transit fund...a new public transit fund that is coming on some time down the line. But they have said it is a 30...a 30-billion-dollar fund, I believe it is. But they said that the funds will not begin to flow until 2026 to 2027. Now, there is some funding available in there that they do indicate that could be, in the program details, that could be used for key public transit projects over the long term. They do say that funding will be delivered through metro region agreements, I will leave that alone. So, we do not know if we will ever get the funding. But the Feds have said they are not going to flow that funding until 2026 to 2027. The Federation of Canadian Municipalities, AMM, has joined the call, as well, with the Big City Mayors Caucus within that, has been calling upon this Federal Government to not wait until 2026 because transit systems across Canada, and certainly within Winnipeg, we need the funds and we need the funds now. So, we have been pressing the Feds to flow the funds now. And we have also asked them to allow cities to stack funding. Even though this project, this North Garage project and other projects already have federal funding, often they do not let us stack funding. We have asked them, permit cities and municipalities to stack the funding so that we could, hopefully, access that funding and do more. But until the Federal Government, until the Provincial Government, step up and say you have got more for these projects that we, as three levels of government, agreed to pay for, we are going to have to make decisions like the decision we are making today. To keep the project cost, the project budget, at 200 million dollars, and ask our staff to do the hard work of pulling out their pencils and redesigning, prioritizing within that project the things that they really, really need for a 200-million-dollar garage to get them going. There is opportunity later on, hopefully, if the funds come in, to expand and add onto that garage. But today we are at the point that unless federal and provincial governments come to the table with more funding for this project, we cannot do more than what we have before us that we have agreed to at this point. I think, at this point, it is the right thing to do on this project. And I appreciate the hard decision and leadership Councillor Lukes has provided. I will be supporting this.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Next is Councillor Schreyer, followed by Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Schreyer: Thank you, Madam Speaker. This sure is a tough one. And no, Madam Speaker, I was not exactly aware of the construction inflation statistic that His Worship has offered us. And hats off, quite frankly, because how can we go through Council on a month-to-month basis without mentioning construction inflation? I do not understand it, But I can see why the Mayor mentioned it. That makes sense. However, let's face it, we have heard all sorts of stuff. And just last year, I was told, when we talked about 2023, I was told in 2023 that my statistics were completely inaccurate. Not by any of our good members of Council here, but it was said in this chamber. Is that true? I do not think so. Remember, I offered; If my statistics were completely inaccurate, I offered my resignation. That offer of resignation still stands. However, I do appreciate when we can correct each other. When we can improve on each other's perspective. And correct each others...enhance each others' equations. And when it comes to Councillor...Mayor Gillingham's statistic of a 55 percent construction inflation rate, was that in one year or three years? What was that...that inflation rate? Well, these are the things we have to talk about. It...pardon me? 2017 to 2023. So, there you go. So, of course, I have not been talking about a four year...yes, four year, I have been talking about over a 30-year...a 30-year period. And I am not the first to mention it at City Hall. I am not the first to mention it from the construction industry. And, yes, I am from the construction industry. A lot of people are from the construction industry. Just like members of the construction industry are taxpayers and voters. I am one of those people from my working life and as a person sitting here, I do come from the construction industry, as well. And I care like anybody else. I feel really much a part of it. And these are our challenges. Now, I am going to say something. If we are...if we are at this point where some would say this...What we are dealing with now contradicts our Transit Master Plan. Some say, well, it does not. Well, it certainly does put a dent in it, doesn't it? It does change our plans, doesn't it? Well, of course it does. That is why the motion is here, to change our plans. Why? It has been said adamantly because we do not have the budget for it. So, that is a change of plans, isn't it? That can change plans notably. That can actually change your Master Plan one way or another to some extent. Well, I am going to tell you something, we have been using a lot of money, a lot of taxpayers' money, a lot of the City's budget. Our finite budget, which is getting harder and harder to deal with...Using it in the name of green...green budget, green fund, for experimental buses. And I am all in favour of experiments, especially when it comes to electric vehicles, electric buses. We have been doing this for decades, it is not new, but we are getting better and better at it. Vivian Santos, she is one of those people that has an electric vehicle, does she not? So, one of those...we are getting there. We are evolving in that direction. It has been a long evolution. Maybe at this point, you know, we are hitting sort of a geometric progression in which, you know, a lot is going to happen in this next decade. As a matter of fact, it will be. We already know that. And to some extent, it has to. But here is one thing that is not necessary. I am all for the experiment, but if we are looking at saving money so much that we are looking at actually reducing our ability to maintain our buses...Look no further, ladies and gentlemen, people of Winnipeg. And I should not be the first to tell you this. I have said it here before, but if we are looking at saving money on transit, we just spent green funding, we just spent money for hydrogen fuel cell buses in the name of green energy, in the name of saving or reducing or stopping fossil fuel emissions. Fellow Canadians, I do not know how to put this, fellow human beings, hydrogen fuel cells, as we are doing it right here, including in Winnipeg, hydrogen fuel cells is absolutely, unequivocally, black and white a greenhouse gas emitting fossil fuel. That is just the way it is. How do we know this? Really simple.

The administration will tell you, because we get our hydrogen from methanol. At the best...at the best, because that is the most efficient form of fossil fuel greenhouse emitting fuel, from which we derive our hydrogen. We do not...the only real way we have of getting hydrogen in a pure way is from water, that is called electrolysis, okay? But it is very expensive, so we do not do it yet. It is not cost effective. It is cost effective to get your hydrogen from a hydrogen fuel cell from methanol. Sure, it is more cost effective, but that makes it not a zero-emission fuel. Thank you, Councillor Wyatt. It is not a zero-emission fuel. It is derived from a very valuable...Which you would like to keep in the ground for generations later. Because it is very valuable. From a...from a fossil fuel...You do not want to burn your fossil fuels if you do not have to. In this case, we are offering it. We are saying, we are going to spend millions of dollars...

Councillor Browaty: Far away from the discussion on...

Councillor Schreyer: Oh, no, Madam Speaker. I can tell you why I am saying this. If we want to save money, let's get rid of the hydrogen fuel cell project. I think that was...I thought that was obvious from when I started. So, I apologize. Madam Speaker, if you want to save money, let's get rid of our hydrogen fuel cell project. Excuse me for not connecting the dots. But we are trying to save money here for Winnipeg Transit. We are...

Councillor Duncan: I do not believe we have any hydrogen fuel cell buses. I do not know what the Councillor is talking about.

Councillor Schreyer: Well, I should explain, Madam Speaker, it has been...it has been part of City Hall, it is been part of administrative reports, and we are moving towards hydrogen fuel cell buses and they have explained why. Yes, hydrogen fuel cell...electrical buses, I have seen a tour, I have seen how they work. They have got the hydrogen fuel cell; they convert it to electricity. And then, that is right. And that is all very well for the private industry, Madam Speaker, if they wish to do so, but if we have got a plan for zero emissions and if we have got a plan to have to reduce our transit buses, this is one way to do it. Why? Because they are more expensive and they do not actually fulfil the obligations of zero emission buses because they are not...

Madam Speaker: Thank you...

Councillor Schreyer: And on that basis, Madam Speaker, this is a serious issue. Look how torn we are on this. Even His Worship has mentioned construction inflation and giving us a statistic. This is a big moment, Madam Speaker. Councillor Wyatt...Councillor Eadie is talking about how he is torn on this because we need more buses, Madam Speaker, if we are going to have an effective transit system. We need warm, safe buses. We need warm, safe bus shelters. And we need to be able to maintain them. That is why we need the garage, to able to maintain our buses to keep them on the road to have the best schedule we have. A guaranteed schedule of more buses so that people can get on their bus. And Winnipeggers, I am going to tell you something, they do not care if they have to spend three more minutes or save three minutes or...They want to get on that bus and spend less time outside when it is pitch black, it is 30 below, they want to get on that bus. Madam Speaker, in Winnipeg winters, it is pitch black before...before you are waiting for the bus and it is pitch black when you get back on the bus. And in the morning, that is the coldest time of the year. Our coldest days in Winnipeg are going to be morning winter rush hours when people have to get on the bus and transfer. That is what matters to Winnipeggers and being able to maintain those buses, keep them on the road, that is the important thing. Hydrogen fuel cells, that is a superfluous use of our city budget...

Madam Speaker: Thank you...

Councillor Schreyer: We want to save money, that is where to cut it. Save our transit system. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Thank you, Councillor Schreyer. Councillor Wyatt.

Councillor Wyatt: Yes, to...I guess you are both right. We are moving in that direction, though. There is five issues or six issues that I see that kind of came up in the Committee and this kind of ties all together. First of all, number one, the decision will have an impact, we heard in the Committee, on the Transit Master Plan that we just voted on in terms of the level of service in the bus fleet. Based on what our own administration said. That was right out Bjorn's mouth to us that the scaling down of the garage will have an impact on the Transit Master Plan that we just voted on, in a negative way, not a positive way. Secondly, the decision, of course, was made by our Public Service to recommend that we buy land for the expanded garage that had...was environmentally impacted and that costs money to remediate. Why did they recommend land that needed environmental remediation? Good question. That is another issue. So, that costs millions of dollars that was not in the budget that all the sudden had to be spent on cleaning the land. Third issue, the decision to move towards hydrogen electric. We are buying electric low-floor buses, but they also are talking about they want us to...they are pushing to get buses coming in for hydrogen electric. There is...Councillor Schreyer is correct. There is dirty...non-green hydrogen. You can also get hydrogen from green energy, i.e. hydro, to make hydrogen. So, there

is...right, thank you. And that is another option. However, what we also learned at the Committee, and this spins off right onto the project, is that the building code has not been yet adopted by the Province to deal with these hydrogen buses. And so, we are not sure whether or not this building will actually have to require, for example, that every bus has to be separated by safety wall, for example, inside the garage. Now you try to add that. That is not even, I think, on this estimate. The fourth issue, if you like, or it is tied to...I guess it is sub-issue of number three and the hydrogen, which...well, actually, no, I am going to come back to that one. The fourth issue is that there is a pattern here, folks, in that we are running into cost overruns. Not just pertaining to this project, but...And it does not mean that one project is bad and another one is good and this one is good and that one is bad. So, you know, it has been raised about, for example, you know, the rec facility out in the south was needed, as the Mayor has said. You know? But we are running into this. We voted on having a...as the Mayor campaigned on, a construction czar, you know? We basically...what we need now is we need that construction czar. We need to coordinate all these projects. We have the North End Treatment Plant which is going over budget. Of course, that is subsidized by our water rates, so we do not...we kind of get glassy-eyed over that one, even though we should probably make it subject to PUB because the rates keep go up and we just pass it on to the rate...to consumer via the rates. Well, it is another cost overrun, we will just pass it on with a higher increase with water rates. You know, that is a tax increase. That is a tax increase. So, we keep doing that. But yet, that one is out...we are not talking about that one as much because that one is Water and Waste rates, but not tax supported like this. Yet, in my view, it is a City of Winnipeg capital project that clearly is not in control in terms of their budgets and where they are going, we need a coordinator. There has to be an overall office coordinating all of this, bringing it together. Because what is happening here, from what I can see, and god bless our Transit staff. We pushed them to roll out a whole overall change, the entire transit system. And they are running around getting that ready. And at the same time we are saying, okay, you are also going to manage capital projects. And you are going to do this, and you have never done it before, but you are going to do it, alright, on this size and scale. We have not done anything of this size and scale before in some time, with regards to transit, at least. And that is the same thing with the rec...our folks in rec. They are scared as heck because they have never built a rec facility of that size and scale since the Pan Am Pool. We need to actually ramp up in terms of our construction if we are a growing city, we keep approving developments, we keep...we are going to build now Kenaston, and I support that project, the expansion. We need to ramp up to get these projects under control. That we have an office that knows what they are doing both in terms of structures, in terms of roads, all of those...and in terms of special industries, I would call it, like a North End Treatment Plant. But that takes front-end resources, that takes people, that takes ingenuity, that takes hiring the right people. More than just one person, a construction czar, but an entire office of many, many construction czars who know how to manage projects of this size and scale. And I know that Madam Speaker is tapping her watch, and I thank her for that reminder. And so, with that point in mind, with the overall construction project and the fact that the fifth issue, in my view, is what have we approved for debt financing? We are at 97 percent if we had given them what they wanted. What do we...what have we approved in the last two years? Three years? Parking Authority came to us in January. We approved them tens of millions of dollars. Why? Because they...I would argue they skewed a report that came to us based on our budget examination that we told...I asked them, how did you establish your point system to determine whether or not you should sell that parkade or whether or not you should fix it? And then, all of a sudden in the hearing, oh, well we could...we were told by Legal that we could not separate a title. Well, we just separated a title over at Winnipeg Square. With the building above and with the parking below, we own the middle. But we cannot separate the library above. Excuse me. But all of a sudden, the same guys who are picking and choosing whether or not we keep the parkade are the very guys who will own it. And there is a problem there in my view. When the entity that is actually wants to keep it is the one deciding how they are going to rank the point system of sale or repair. We approved 14 and almost 15 million, and we are in the hook for 30, and potentially, we had another report that said as high as 50. We have given the green light on that. And that is going ahead. We can rescind it. We could free up some debt money. And the other suggestion that was made at the Committee is we could actually review all of the debt strategy...debt decisions we have made on capital projects in the last year or two years, even three, and figure out which ones maybe we got to have another look at one based on the priorities, based on staff, based on the Mayor's commitments that he has made and revisit those decisions. I would welcome that based on that kind of rational. And then, finally, the biggest issue, and it comes back to the hydrogen issue, which came up in a...the report that is not on the agenda here because it was delegated authority to the standing committee, is the safety of these buses with...hydrogen electric. Thermal incidences. And that scared the heck out of me because I do not...you know, our staff should be gung-ho to move down the hydrogen route, but we found out that there is no other city of our size and scale that is ordering hydrogen in this kind of cold climate and they are having...they are having incidences in other parts of North America. Hydrogen...remember, hydrogen is the same fuel that was the Hindenburg, okay? Alright. Same thing. So, we got to...well...well, it does not matter. This stuff is explosive. It is explosive and it can blow, so...(laughs) Well, all I know, Madam Speaker, is this stuff...it was explained to us that the building code could actually recommend, for safety reasons, for employees to actually have separate units for each bus inside this garage. And that, to me, set off a red flag when I am hearing that there is incidences taking place with regards to thermal incidences. And that is what they called it. Thermal incidences. I think there has to be a review. Are...do we really need to go the hydrogen route or could we go the electric bus route with low-floor buses and it would serve the same purpose that we need without taking the big leap to hydrogen. I asked, have you looked at Europe? Have you looked at northern Europe? Scandinavia? They did not have any examples, any idea of what would actually be

comparable to Winnipeg in terms of this technology. These are the things that concern me, Madam Speaker. I did not support the report because I was perplexed because we had just voted on the Transit Master Plan. I think I was the only member of Council not to vote for the Transit Master Plan. But we actually voted on the Transit Master Plan almost unanimously in this Chamber and now we are voting to change it de facto by reducing the scale of this project. And maybe there is an opportunity to allow for this project to come on stream. But I am still have major, major misgivings with the fact that I do not think they have the expertise to run a project of this size and scale, to be honest. I think they are excellent staff, by the way...

Madam Speaker: Two-minute extension. All in favour?

Councillor Wyatt: Thank you...

Madam Speaker: Contrary? Carried.

Councillor Wyatt: They are excellent staff. I do not want to knock the Committee, but this is a big project, number one. And number two, the decision to go hydrogen versus hydro...versus straight electric is a huge decision to make. Huge. And I do not think there has been a full analysis done of that and there is not a full coordination of our existing capital projects of a major scale like this. And finally, we have not really reviewed the debt of other projects that we have given green lights to that maybe we should not, and maybe we should reconsider. So, I think there is a lot of issues that could potentially bring something like this back on track. But I am concerned, and I agree with the Mayor, with what his comments were with regards to the budget going from 20...yes, it was a class five in 2019, now it has jumped up by a hundred million dollars or a third, if you like, from there to now. I mean, that red flag...why would you buy land that is environmentally impacted, right? Like, or recommend that to us. We went through that dialogue at the Committee. I remember we made the decision. That did not come up. All of a sudden, now it is environmentally impacted...Shows up in a report now. No, not much due diligence on this report on the environmental impact land. All of a sudden, this shows up. I have concerns. Does it mean we throw the baby out with the bath water? No. Does it mean we roll up our sleeves to try and solve them? Yes. Because if we believe in the Transit Master Plan...I did not support it, but it is now Council policy. Let's stick to it and find a way to make it work. Those are my concerns in a nutshell. And thank you, Madam Speaker. I do not know how I am going to vote on it yet but thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Any further speakers? Councillor Browaty.

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I won't speak long. We have had a fairly long day already...or very long day. I will be supporting this. I thank the Standing Policy Committee on Infrastructure Renewal and Public Works for taking, I think, the tough decision to scale back the project to the 200 million dollars. Again, I think we have opportunities to ensure that we have the transit system and the transit network we want with the 200-million-dollar investment. I mean, in the interim, there is the possibility we could get...We know it is end of life. We know the Main Street garage is on its last legs. But what is to stop us from perhaps, you know, using it as a storage facility for a period of time? As it is already operationally. They only use the Main Street bridge on the weekends. It really is, basically, a storage barn. And as the member of the union mentioned this morning there that, you know, they...the maintenance facilities in there are fairly limited. So, again, I think there is an opportunity. And you know, to Councillor Wyatt's point, again, I am not going to pretend to be an expert on hydrogen buses. I do know that, you know, anything is possible. And during FCM in Calgary in June, I toured the new Stoney Mountain transit facility in Calgary. Those buses are filled with natural gas. Natural gas is also very dangerous. They have a totally separate area, bomb-proof-style facility for the indoor fueling of those buses and they have air exchange equipment that is completely wild to mitigate that. I should point out that that garage is not that old. It was built through a P3 and it also cost about 200 million dollars, but...And I think it is quite a bit larger than what we are proposing. So, fair enough. Anyways, we are scaling here. We will have Transit come back in the near term. Why I think it is important to keep it at the 200 million dollars? Again, this is a project where we have that shared money, and we are going to get the best bang out of...out of our own dollars. Again, we do not know what is going to happen in terms of a possible change in government during the next federal election. What will happen to this permanent transit fund? We do not know that yet. But there is still the prospect of there being future transit grants. And again, should, you know, ATU come out and, you know, find money from our friends in Ottawa and on Broadway, great. Let's see if we can go back to the full project. But I think this is a responsible decision for the money we have now. I look forward to Transit coming forward with a viable path forward to getting a very good facility for the 200 million dollars allocated. Thank you.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Councillor Lukes to close.

Councillor Lukes: Okay, wow. Everyone made some really good points here. Yes, I must say, out of all the decisions we have made in Public Works, this one...the e-mails that I got on this one were quite outstanding and quite intense. A lot of people read headlines. A lot of people do not really get into the details of an article and a lot of people really do not

understand the budget at City Hall and where we are at. So, I would think for the Public Works Committee this is probably one of the hardest decisions we made to support option three by reducing the scope of the current project to match the existing approved budget. Now, as was mentioned, you note in the report we pitched the project to the federal and provincial governments when money was available at a class five estimate. We received funding from both levels: 73 from the Feds, 61 from the Province and the City is putting 66 million in. So, what we did was, we asked the Department to come back in January with a revised plan on what 200 million dollars would get us for a garage. You know, can you include maintenance in it? What type of storage will be included in it? What will we do for our movement to zero emission buses? What will be included? So, we are going to wait till January. We are pushing the Public Service hard on this. I met with them, I do not know, Monday, Tuesday of this week, with the project manager for the garage. They are going to look at the North Garage. There would be operational costs involved. They are going to look at a lot of options, and they are going to come back. They are going to come back to the Finance Committee. So, the City owns this land on Route 90 and Inkster where the garage will be constructed. We still own the land at the North Garage and the garage. And Transit is taking all of this into their consideration when they come back in January. But I do want to make note, and I think this is really important, it was...it was really not an easy decision at all. And to think that...you know, to be frustrated and to say, oh, this is...you know, I cannot support this. I simply cannot support this...Open your mind to the bigger picture, right? Open your mind to where we are at in the city. We...this Council has done more for Transit than a lot of Councils in the past. I came on board and I was on the Council in 2014 when we voted on how to pay for the rapid transit corridor. So for the, you know, for the last ten years, we have been doing incredible work for Transit. We have moved to a high-frequency network coming this July. We have hired an accessibility coordinator to work on issues. We have added more routes. Madam Speaker, you just had one. A couple more routes coming next year. We streamlined...this is interesting. We have streamlined the hiring process for drivers. And this year, we are going to break past previous years records of hiring 164 drivers. We are going to be way above that. We have added a safety team. We have provided outstanding support for Transit. And I think it is reflective of how we all want a better transit system. We are converting to zero emission buses through hydrogen and electrification. But the sad matter is we have a debt ceiling of 150 million. And I want to remind residents and Councillors that the City of Winnipeg Finance...We have experienced a 200-million-dollar impact because of COVID, and that does not just get better in no time. Because of that 200-million-dollar impact, we have...it has impacted the fiscal stabilization fund. It has been reduced and drained, and that is why our ability for debt also is restricted. And then, you add a large list of other projects that also are critical projects that have no funding. Our number one priority is the sewage treatment plant. Granted, it is...it is a utility, but still, it is a tax like Councillor Wyatt noted. The Arlington Bridge. No money for that. It is going to come forward. St. James Bridge. No money to fix that. Kenaston, Chief Peguis trade corridors. But we have the land. We have 200 million dollars. We have smart people. I think there is areas for optimism, federally, as Councillor Browaty said. And I think it was Councillor Wyatt or maybe it was the Mayor stated, you know, that there is funding. There is a transit plan that is being put together. Federally, there is optimism there. But federally, we are not alone as a city in our challenge to support transit expansions and conversion to zero emission buses. Transit agencies across the country are facing a fiscal cliff that is affecting their ability to maintain existing, let alone expansion, of transit service to people that rely on transit. We are not the only ones here. I really encourage you...and I would ask the two delegations today if they had read it. I encourage you to read the End of the Line report because we are kind of at the end of the line here on transit and a few other things. It presents really interesting revenue solutions that cities could move forward on. But also, as Councillor Rollins noted, most of the initiatives require provincial approval. And that is a challenge, right? We are looking for the revenue. So, the Federal Government is acutely aware of this issue with transit across the nation. Now, once we get this election over, whatever is going to happen, let's hold some optimism federally. They are busy with many other things right now and I am sure they do not want to hear delegations talking about transit. But provincially, we have to hold optimism, too. The current government understands the importance of transit. I know they understand the importance of transit. The positive impact it has on individuals' ability to be employed, the overall positive economic impact it has on the economy. Now, I have not heard any statements yet from our new government related to transit. And I would like to think it is because they are really doing a comprehensive analysis to understand and bring themselves up to speed now that they are the government in power, on how the City can best deliver excellent transit service. So, I hold optimism that that is what they are looking at. We are going to be meeting with our counterparts in the Provincial Government. But I encourage all my colleagues to reach out to your provincial MLAs. And Councillor Rollins said it incredibly well...Talk to them about transit. Talk to them...talk to them about maybe winding up this gas tax holiday at the end of December and maybe using 165 million for transit going forward. That would be incredible. We...I am going to hold great optimism for the Province, because I think they really understand the City's situation. I know, and we have mentioned this before, the Premier mentioned it in the budget, that he understands that out of every tax dollar, the cities get 10 cents, and we have to do all of this. In transit, we are at the end of the line. We cannot afford to do electrification. We cannot afford to do conversions. It is...it is incredibly expensive, the infrastructure required to...and even...even former Transit Director Dave Wardrop sat me down back in 2015 and said we are entering into this transition period, and transit won't improve because it is so costly unless we get significant funding from elsewhere. And it won't. And that is...that is the fact of the matter. So, all of you colleagues here who have really close ties to the current Provincial Government, you go out with your MLAs, we cannot do it. We are at the end of the line with our transit funding. So, we have the land. We have optimism. And we will leave it at that.

Madam Speaker: Thank you. Call the question on Item 1. All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. All in favour, please rise.

A RECORDED VOTE was taken the result being as follows:

Yeas

His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Lukes, Mayes, Rollins, Santos, Wyatt, and Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma.

Nays

Councillors Eadie, Gilroy and Schreyer.

City Clerk: The vote Madam Speaker, Yeas 12, Nays 3.

Madam Speaker: Item 1 passes. Onto Motion 5: moved by Councillor Dobson, seconded by Councillor Schreyer. It is an automatic referral to the Standing Committee. It is regarding parking for veterans. We will now move into by-laws under this committee. Councillor Lukes, our Chair.

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
MOTIONS**

Motion No. 5

**Moved by Councillor Dobson,
Seconded by Councillor Schreyer,**

WHEREAS on October 24, 2012 Council approved the provision of complimentary on-street parking for Veterans on a year-round basis through Veteran specific coupon books;

AND WHEREAS other Canadian cities have instituted similar measures for Veterans;

AND WHEREAS the City of Vancouver provides free year-round parking for any vehicles displaying a Veteran licence plate at any on-street pay parking space and City-owned off-street parking facilities;

THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED:

1. *That Recommendation 1 of the Council Decision dated October 24, 2012 on Item 2, of the Report of the Executive Policy Committee dated October 17, 2012, be rescinded.*
2. *That the Winnipeg Public Service be instructed to provide complimentary year-round on-street parking for any vehicle displaying a Veteran license plate, subject to parking limits and any other posted regulations.*
3. *That the Proper Officers of the City be authorized to do all things necessary to fulfill the intent of the foregoing.*

**STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON PUBLIC WORKS
CONSIDERATION OF BY-LAWS**

Councillor Lukes: Okay. I would like to move the following by-laws read a first time: By-law No. 93/2024, 94/2024, 1120...112/2024.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law No. 93/2024, By-law No. 94/2024, By-law No. 112/2024.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that By-laws No. 93/2024, 94/2024 and 112/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-law Nos. 93/2024, 94/2024 and 112/2024.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that By-laws No. 93/2024, 94/2024 and 112/2024 be read a second time.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried.

Clerk: By-laws No. 93/2024, 94/2024 and 112/2024.

Councillor Lukes: I would like to move that the rule be suspended and By-laws No. 93/2024, 94/2024 and 112/2024 be read a third time and that same be passed and ordered to be signed and sealed.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. Any questions for our Chair? Okay. Next committee, Standing Policy Committee on Finance and Economic Development. Chair Councillor Browaty.

**REPORT OF THE
STANDING POLICY COMMITTEE ON FINANCE AND ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT
DATED SEPTEMBER 16, 2024**

Councillor Browaty: Thank you very much, Madam Speaker. I would like to introduce the report of September 16th, 2024, and move adoption of consent agenda Item 1.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? That is carried. We have no by-laws. Any questions for our Chair under this committee? Okay. That concludes our agenda for today. Mayor Gillingham, will you move adjournment?

Mayor Gillingham: So moved, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker: All in favour? Contrary? Carried. Please stay for roll call. Madam Clerk.

ROLL CALL

Clerk: Madam Speaker Councillor Sharma, His Worship Mayor Gillingham, Councillors Allard, Browaty, Chambers, Dobson, Duncan, Eadie, Gilroy, Lukes, Rollins, Santos, Schreyer and Councillor Wyatt.

Council adjourned at 8:26 p.m.